

CHARACTERIZING AN  $\aleph_e$ -SATURATED  
MODEL OF SUPERSTABLE NDOP  
THEORIES BY ITS  $L_{\infty, \aleph_e}$ -THEORY  
SH401

SAHARON SHELAH

Institute of Mathematics  
The Hebrew University  
Jerusalem, Israel

Department of Mathematics  
Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, NJ USA

MSRI  
Berkeley, CA USA

---

Partially supported by the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation and the NSF, and  
I thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.

Done Oct/89

Publ No. 401

Latest Revision - 96/Sept/10

Typeset by  $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ -TEX

## INTRODUCTION

After the main gap theorem was proved (see [Sh:c]), in discussion, Harrington expressed a desire for a finer structure - of finitary character (when we have a structure theorem at all). I point out that the logic  $L_{\infty, \aleph_0}(\text{d.q.})$  (d.q. stands for dimension quantifier) does not suffice: suppose; e.g. for  $T = Th(\lambda \times {}^\omega 2, E_n)_{n < \omega}$  where  $(\alpha, \eta)E_n(\beta, \nu) =: \eta \upharpoonright n = \nu \upharpoonright n$  and for  $S \subseteq {}^\omega 2$  define  $M_S = M \upharpoonright \{(\alpha, \eta) : [\eta \in S \Rightarrow \alpha < \omega_1] \text{ and } [\eta \in {}^\omega 2 \setminus S \Rightarrow \alpha < \omega]\}$ . Hence, it seems to me we should try  $L_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}(\text{d.q.})$  (essentially, in  $\mathfrak{C}$  we can quantify over sets which are included in the algebraic closure of finite sets, see below 1.1, 1.2), and Harrington accepts this interpretation. Here the conjecture is proved for  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated models.

I.e., the main theorem is  $M \equiv_{\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}(\text{d.q.})} N \Leftrightarrow M \cong N$  for  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated models of a superstable countable (first order) theory  $T$  without dop. For this we analyze further regular types, define a kind of infinitary logic (more exactly, a kind of type of  $\bar{a}$  in  $M$ ), “looking only up” in the definition (when thinking of the decomposition theorem). To carry out the isomorphism proof we need: (1.24) the type of the sum is the sum of types (infinitary types) assuming first order independence. The main point to construct an isomorphism between  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  when  $M_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}(\text{d.q.})} M_2, Th(M_\ell) = T$  as above. So by [Sh:c, X] it is enough to construct isomorphic decompositions. The construction of isomorphic decompositions is by  $\omega$  approximations, in stage  $n$ ,  $\sim n$  levels of the decomposition tree are approximated, i.e. we have  $I_n^\ell \subseteq {}^{n \geq \text{Ord}}$  and  $\bar{a}_\eta^{n, \ell} \in M_\ell$  for  $\eta \in I_n, \ell = 1, 2$  such that  $\text{tp}(\bar{a}_{\eta \upharpoonright 0}^{n, 1} \wedge \bar{a}_{\eta \upharpoonright 1}^{n, 1} \wedge \dots \wedge \bar{a}_\eta^{n, 1}, \emptyset, M) = \text{tp}(\bar{a}_{\eta \upharpoonright 0}^{n, 2} \wedge \bar{a}_{\eta \upharpoonright 1}^{n, 2} \wedge \dots \wedge \bar{a}_\eta^{n, 2}, \emptyset, M_2)$  with  $\bar{a}_\eta^{n, \ell}$  being  $\epsilon$ -finite, so in stage  $n+1$ , choosing  $\bar{a}_\langle \rangle^{n+1, \ell}$  we cannot take care of all types  $\bar{a}_\langle \rangle^{n+1, \ell} \wedge \bar{a}_{\langle \alpha \rangle}^{n, \ell}$  so addition theorem takes care.

In the end of §1 (in 1.34) we point up that the addition theorem holds in fuller generalization. In the second section we deal with a finer type needed for shallow  $T$ , in the appendix we discuss how absolute is the isomorphism type.

Subsequently Hrushovski and Bouscaren proved that even if  $T$  is  $\aleph_0$ -stable,  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_0}(\text{d.q.})$  is not sufficient. In fact they found two examples: in one  $T$  is (in addition)  $\aleph_0$ -stable of rank 3 and in the second it is not multidimensional. Moreover, the examples show that even in the case of  $\aleph_0$ -stable theories,  $L_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}(\text{d.q.})$  is not sufficient if one considers the class of all models. The first example is  $\aleph_0$ -stable shallow of depth 3, and the second one is superstable (non  $\aleph_0$ -stable), NOTOP, non-multidimensional.

If we deal with  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated models of shallow (superstable NDOP) theories  $T$ , we can bound the depth of the quantification  $\gamma = DP(T)$ ; i.e.  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}^\gamma$  suffice.

We assume the reader has a reasonable knowledge of [Sh:c, V, §1, §2] and mainly [Sh:c, V, §3] and of [Sh:c, X].

Here is a slightly more detailed guide to the paper. In 1.1 we define the logic  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}$  and in 1.2 give a back and forth characterization of equivalence in this logic which is the operative definition for this paper.

The major tools are defined in 1.5, 1.7. In particular, the notion of  $\text{tp}_\alpha$  defined in 1.5 is a kind of a depth  $\alpha$  look-ahead which is actually used in the final construction. In 1.25 we point out that equivalence in the logic  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}$  implies equivalence with respect to  $\text{tp}_\alpha$  for all  $\alpha$ . Proposition 1.10 contains a number of important concrete assertions which are established by means of Facts 1.6A-F. In general these explain

the properties of decompositions over a pair  $\binom{B}{A}$ . Claim 1.24 (which follows from 1.23) is a key step in the final induction. Definition 1.27 establishes the framework for the proof that two  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated structures that have the same  $\text{tp}_\infty$  are isomorphic. The induction step is carried out in 1.32.

I thank Baldwin for reading the typescript pointing needed corrections and writing down some explanations.

Notation: The notation is of [Sh:c], with the following additions (or reminders).

If  $\eta = \nu \hat{\ } \langle \alpha \rangle$  then we let  $\eta^- = \nu$ ; for  $I$  is a set of sequences ordinals we let  $\text{Suc}_T(\eta) = \{\nu : \text{for some } \alpha, \nu = \eta \hat{\ } \langle \alpha \rangle \in I\}$ .

We work in  $\mathfrak{C}^{eq}$  and for simplicity every first order formula is equivalent to a relation:

$\perp$  means orthogonal (so  $q$  is  $\perp p$  means  $q$  is orthogonal to  $p$ ),  
remember  $p \perp A$  means  $p$  orthogonal to  $A$ ; i.e.  $p \perp q$  for every  
 $q \in S(\text{acl}(A))$  (in  $\mathfrak{C}^{eq}$ )

$\perp_a$  means almost orthogonal

$\perp_w$  means weakly orthogonal

$\frac{\bar{a}}{B}$  and  $\bar{a}/B$  means  $\text{tp}(\bar{a}, B)$

$\frac{A}{B}$  or  $A/B$  means  $\text{tp}_*(A, B)$

$A + B$  means  $A \cup B$

$\bigcup_A \{B_i : i < \alpha\}$  means  $\{B_i : i < \alpha\}$  is independent over  $A$

$A \bigcup_B C$  means  $\{A, C\}$  is independent over  $B$

$\{C_i : i < \alpha\}$  is independent over  $(B, A)$  means

$j < \alpha \Rightarrow \text{tp}_* \left( C_j, \bigcup_{i \neq j} C_i \cup B \right)$  does not fork over  $A$

regular type means stationary regular type  $p \in S(A)$  for some  $A$

for  $p \in S(A)$  regular and  $C$  a set of elements realizing  $p$ ,  $\dim(C, p)$  is

$\text{Max}\{|\mathbf{I}| : \mathbf{I} \subseteq C \text{ is independent over } A\}$

$\text{acl}(A) = \{c : \text{tp}(c, A) \text{ is algebraic}\}$

$\text{dcl}(A) = \{c : \text{tp}(c, A) \text{ is realized by one and only one element}\}$

$\text{Dp}(p)$  is depth (of a stationary type, see [Sh:c, X, Definition 4.3, p.528, Definition 4.4, p.529])

$\text{Cb}(p)$  is the canonical base of a stationary type  $p$  (see [Sh:c, III, 6.10, p.134])

§1  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -SATURATED MODELS

We first define our logic, but as said in §0, we shall only use the condition from 1.3.

**1.1 Definition.** 1) The logic  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}$  is slightly stronger than  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_0}$ , it consists of the set of formulas in  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_1}$  such that any subformula of  $\psi$  of the form  $(\exists \bar{x})\varphi$  it actually has the form

$$(\exists \bar{x}^0, \bar{x}^1) \left[ \varphi_1(\bar{x}^1, \bar{y}) \ \& \ \bigwedge_{i < \ell g \bar{x}^1} (\theta_i(x_i^1, \bar{x}^0) \ \& \ (\exists^{< \aleph_0} z) \theta_i(z, \bar{x}^0)) \right], \bar{x}^0 \text{ finite, } \bar{x}^1 \text{ not nec-}$$

essarily finite; so  $\varphi$  “says”  $\bar{x}^1 \subseteq acl(\bar{x}^0)$ .

2)  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}(d.q.)$  is like  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}$  but we have cardinality quantifiers and moreover dimensional quantifiers (as in [Sh:c, XIII, 1.2, p.624]).

3) The logic  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}^\gamma$  consist of the formulas of  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}$  such that  $\varphi$  has quantifier depth  $< \gamma$  (but we start the inductive definition by defining the quantifier depth of all first order as zero).

4)  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}^\gamma(d.q.)$  is like  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}^\gamma$  but we have cardinality quantifiers and moreover dimensional quantifiers. In fact the dimension quantifier is used in a very restricted way (see Definition 1.6 and Claim 1.25 + Claim 1.27).

**1.2 Convention.** 1)  $T$  is a fixed first order complete theory,  $\mathfrak{C}$  is as in [Sh:c], so is  $\bar{\kappa}$ -saturated;  $\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$  is as in [Sh:c, III, 6.2, p.131]. We work in  $\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$  so  $M, N$  vary on elementary submodels of  $\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$  of cardinality  $< \bar{\kappa}$ . We assume  $T$  is superstable with NDOP (countability is used only in the Proof of 1.4 for bookkeeping).

Remember  $a, b, c, d$  denote members of  $\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$ ,  $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}, \bar{d}$  denote finite sequences of members of  $\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$ ,  $A, B, C$  denote subsets of  $\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$  of cardinality  $< \bar{\kappa}$ .

Remember  $acl(A)$  is the algebraic closure of  $A$ , i.e.

$\{b : \text{for some first order and } n < \omega, \varphi(x, \bar{y}) \text{ and } \bar{a} \subseteq A \text{ we have } \mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}} \models \varphi[b, \bar{a}] \ \& \ (\exists^{< n} y) \varphi(y, \bar{a})\}$  and  $\bar{a}$  denotes  $\text{Rang}(\bar{a})$  in places where it stands for a set (as in  $acl(\bar{a})$ ). We write  $\bar{a} \in A$  instead of  $\bar{a} \in {}^{\omega>} (A)$ .

2)  $A$  is  $\epsilon$ -finite, if for some  $\bar{a} \in {}^{\omega>} A$ ,  $A = acl(\bar{a})$ . (So for stable theories a subset of an  $\epsilon$ -finite set is not necessarily  $\epsilon$ -finite but as  $T$  is superstable, a subset of an  $\epsilon$ -finite set is  $\epsilon$ -finite as if  $B \subseteq acl(\bar{a})$ ,  $\bar{b} \in B$  is such that  $\text{tp}(\bar{a}, B)$  does not fork over  $\bar{b}$ , then trivially  $acl(\bar{b}) \subseteq A$  and if  $acl(\bar{b}) \neq B$ ,  $\text{tp}_*(B, \bar{a} \wedge \bar{b})$  forks over  $B$ , hence ([Sh:c, III, 0.1])  $\text{tp}(\bar{a}, B)$  forks over  $\bar{b}$ , a contradiction.

So if  $acl(A) = acl(B)$ , then  $A$  is  $\epsilon$ -finite iff  $B$  is  $\epsilon$ -finite).

3) When  $T$  is superstable by [Sh:c, IV, Table 1, p.169] for  $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^a$ , all the axioms there hold and we write  $\aleph_\epsilon$  instead of  $\mathbf{F}$  and may use implicitly the consequences in [Sh:c, IV, §3].

We may instead Definition 1.1 use directly the standard characterization from 1.3; as actually less is used we state the condition we shall actually use:

**1.3 Claim.** For models  $M_1, M_2$  of  $T$  we have  $M_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}(d.q.)} M_2$  if

⊗ there is a family  $F$  such that:

- (a) each  $f \in F$  is an  $(M_1, M_2)$ -elementary mapping, (so  $\text{Dom}(f) \subseteq M_1$ ,  $\text{Rang}(f) \subseteq M_2$ )

- (b) for  $f \in F$ ,  $\text{Dom}(f)$  is  $\epsilon$ -finite (see 1.2(2)) above)
- (c) if  $f \in F$ ,  $\bar{a}_\ell \in M_\ell$  ( $\ell = 1, 2$ ) then for some  $g \in F$  we have:  
 $f \subseteq g$  and  $\text{acl}(\bar{a}_1) \in \text{Dom}(f)$  and  $\text{acl}(\bar{a}_2) \in \text{Rang}(f)$
- (d) if  $f \cup \{\langle a_1, a_2 \rangle\} \in F$  and  $\text{tp}(a_1, \text{Dom}(f))$  is stationary and regular then  
 $\dim(\{a_1^1 \in M_1 : f \cup \{\langle a_1^1, a_2 \rangle\} \in F\}, M_1)$   
 $= \dim(\{a_2^1 \in M_2 : f \cup \{\langle a_1, a_2^1 \rangle\} \in F\}, M_2).$

Our main theorem is

**1.4 Theorem.** Suppose  $T$  is countable (superstable complete first order theory) with NDOP.

Then

- (1) the  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}(d.q.)$  theory of an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated model characterizes it up to isomorphism.
- (2) Moreover, if  $M_1, M_2$  are  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated models of  $T$  (so  $M_\ell \prec \mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$ ) and  $\bigotimes_{M_0, M_1}$  of 1.3 holds, then  $M_1, M_2$  are isomorphic.

By 1.3, it suffices to prove part (2).

\* \* \*

The proof is broken into a series of claims (some of them do not use NDOP).

Discussion: Let us motivate the notation and Definition below. Suppose  $N_0 \prec N_1 \prec N_2$  are  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated and for  $\ell = 0, 1$ ,  $N_{\ell+1}$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_\ell + b_\ell$  where  $b_\ell/N_\ell$  is regular and  $(b_1/N_1) \perp N_0$  (this arises naturally in the Decomposition theorem).

We try to extract a finitary description we can choose. If  $A_\ell \subseteq N_\ell$  is such that  $b_\ell/N_\ell$  does not fork over  $A_\ell$ ,  $b_\ell/A_\ell$  stationary (and  $A_\ell$  is  $\epsilon$ -finite, of course) then to a large extent  $A_0, b_0$  capture the essential part of extending  $N_0$  to  $N_1$ . However, to see “the successor” pair  $(N_1, N_2)$  ( $\leq_b$  below) we need to make  $A_1$  explicit, for this we want to extend  $(A_0, b_0)$  to  $(A_0, b_0 + A_1)$ , but  $A_1$  was not arbitrary,  $A_1 \subseteq N_1$ ,  $N_1$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_0 + b_0$ , so the reasonable way is to extend  $A_0$  to some  $\epsilon$ -finite  $A_0^+ \subseteq N_0$  such that  $A_1/(A_0^+ + b_0)$  isolate the type  $A_1/(N_0 + b_0)$ , this is  $\leq_a$  below.

**1.5 Definition.** 1)  $\Gamma = \{(A, B) : A \subseteq B \text{ are } \epsilon\text{-finite}\}$ . Let

$\Gamma(M) = \{(A, B) \in \Gamma : A \subseteq B \subseteq M\}$ .

2) For members of  $\Gamma$  we write also  $\binom{B}{A}$ , if  $A \not\subseteq B$  we mean  $\binom{B \cup A}{A}$ .

3)  $\binom{B_1}{A_1} \leq_a \binom{B_2}{A_2}$  (usually we omit  $a$ ) if (both are in  $\Gamma$  and)

$A_1 \subseteq A_2, B_1 \subseteq B_2, B_1 \bigcup_{A_1} A_2$  and  $\frac{B_2}{B_1 + A_2} \perp_a A_2$ .

4)  $\binom{B_1}{A_1} \leq_b \binom{B_2}{A_2}$  if  $A_2 = B_1, B_2 \setminus A_2 = \bar{b}$  and  $\frac{\bar{b}}{A_2}$  is regular orthogonal to  $A_1$ .

5)  $\leq^*$  is the transitive closure of  $\leq_a \cup \leq_b$ . (So it is a partial order, whereas in general  $\leq_a \cup \leq_b$  and  $\leq_b$  are not).

6) We can replace  $A, B$  by sequences listing them (we do not always strictly distinguish).

**1.6 Definition.** 1) We define  $\text{tp}_\alpha[(\frac{B}{A}), M]$  (for  $A \subseteq B \subseteq M$ ,  $A$  and  $B$  are  $\epsilon$ -finite and  $\alpha$  is an ordinal) and  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha((\frac{B}{A}), M)$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(A, M)$  and  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha^r((\frac{B}{A}), M)$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha^r(A, M)$  by induction on  $\alpha$  (simultaneously we mean; of course, we use appropriate variables):

- (a)  $\text{tp}_0[(\frac{B}{A}), M]$  is the first order type of  $A \cup B$
- (b)  $\text{tp}_{\alpha+1}[(\frac{B}{A}), M] =$  the triple  $\langle Y_{A,B,M}^{1,\alpha}, Y_{A,B,M}^{2,\alpha}, \text{tp}_\alpha((\frac{B}{A}), M) \rangle$   
 where:  
 $Y_{A,B,M}^{1,\alpha} =: \left\{ \text{tp}_\alpha[(\frac{B'}{A'}), M] : \text{for some } A', B' \text{ we have } (\frac{B}{A}) \leq_a (\frac{B'}{A'}) \in \Gamma(M) \right\},$   
 and  $Y_{A,B,M}^{2,\alpha} =: \left\{ \langle \Upsilon, \lambda_{M,B}^\Upsilon \rangle : \Upsilon \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^r(B, M) \right\}$   
 where  $\lambda_{M,B}^\Upsilon = \dim \left[ \left\{ d : \text{tp}_\alpha[(\frac{B+d}{B}), M] = \Upsilon \right\}, B \right]$
- (c) for  $\delta$  a limit ordinal,  $\text{tp}_\delta[(\frac{B}{A}), M] = \langle \text{tp}_\alpha[(\frac{B}{A}), M] : \alpha < \delta \rangle$   
 (this includes  $\delta = \infty$ , really  $\|M\|^+$  suffice).
- (d)  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(A, M) = \left\{ \text{tp}_\alpha[(\frac{B}{A}), M] : \text{for some } B \text{ such that } B \subseteq M, \right.$   
 $\left. \text{and } (\frac{B}{A}) \in \Gamma(M) \right\}$
- (e)  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha^r((\frac{B}{A}), M) = \left\{ \text{tp}_\alpha[(\frac{B+c}{B}), M] : \text{for some } c \in M \text{ we have } \right.$   
 $\left. \frac{c}{B} \perp A \text{ and } \frac{c}{B} \text{ regular} \right\}$
- (f)  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha^r(A, M) = \left\{ \text{tp}_\alpha[(\frac{A+c}{A}), M] : c \in M \text{ and } \frac{c}{A} \text{ regular} \right\}.$

2) We define also  $\text{tp}_\alpha[A, M]$ , for  $A$  an  $\epsilon$ -finite subset of  $M$ :

- (a)  $\text{tp}_0[A, M] =$  first order type of  $A$
- (b)  $\text{tp}_{\alpha+1}[A, M]$  is the triple  $\langle Y_{A,M}^{1,\alpha}, Y_{A,M}^{2,\alpha}, \text{tp}_\alpha[A, M] \rangle$  where  
 $Y_{A,M}^{1,\alpha} =: \mathcal{S}_\alpha(A; M)$  and  
 $Y_{A,M}^{2,\alpha} =: \left\{ \langle \Upsilon, \dim\{d \in M : \text{tp}_\alpha[(\frac{A+d}{A}), M] = \Upsilon\} \rangle : \Upsilon \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^r(A, M) \right\}$
- (c)  $\text{tp}_\delta[A, M] = \langle \text{tp}_\alpha(A, M) : \alpha < \delta \rangle$

3)  $\text{tp}_\alpha[M] = \text{tp}_\alpha[\emptyset, M]$ .

**1.7 Definition.** 1)  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  above (or for or over)  $(\frac{B}{A})$  (but we may omit the “ $\aleph_\epsilon$  - ”) if:

- (a)  $I$  a set of finite sequences of ordinals closed under initial segments
- (b)  $\langle \rangle, \langle 0 \rangle \in I, \eta \in I \setminus \{\langle \rangle\} \Rightarrow \langle 0 \rangle \leq \eta$ , let  $I^- = I \setminus \{\langle \rangle\}$ , really  $a_{\langle \rangle}$  is meaningless
- (c)  $A \subseteq N_{\langle \rangle}, B \subseteq N_{\langle 0 \rangle}, N_{\langle \rangle} \bigcup_A B$  and  $dcl(\bar{a}_{\langle 0 \rangle}) = dcl(B)$ ,
- (d) if  $\nu = \eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle \in I$  then  $N_\nu$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $N_\eta \cup \bar{a}_\nu, N_{\langle \rangle}$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $A$

- (e) for  $\eta \in I$  such that  $k = \ell g(\eta) > 1$  the type  $a_\eta/N_{\eta \upharpoonright (k-1)}$  is orthogonal to  $N_{\eta \upharpoonright (k-2)}$
  - (f)  $\eta \triangleleft \nu \Rightarrow N_\eta \prec N_\nu$
  - (g)  $M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated and  $N_\eta \prec M$  for  $\eta \in I$
  - (h) if  $\eta \in I \setminus \{\langle \rangle\}$ , then  $\{a_\nu : \nu \in \text{Suc}_I(\eta)\}$  is (a set of elements realizing over  $N_\eta$  types orthogonal to  $N_{\eta^-}$  and is) an independent set over  $N_\eta$ .
- 2) We replace “inside  $M$ ” by “of  $M$ ” if in addition
- (i) in clause (h) the set is maximal.
- 3)  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  if (a), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) of part (1) holds and in clause (h) we allow  $\eta = \langle \rangle$  (call this  $(h)^+$ ).
- 4)  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  if in addition to 1.7(3) and we have the stronger version of clause (i) of 1.7(2) by including  $\eta = \langle \rangle$ , i.e. we have:

(i)<sup>+</sup> for  $\nu \in I$ , the set  $\{a_\eta : \eta \in \text{Suc}_I(\nu)\}$  is a maximal subset of  $M$  independent over  $N_\nu$ .

5) If  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  we let

$$\mathcal{P}(\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle, M) = \left\{ p \in S(M) : p \text{ regular and for some } \eta \in I \setminus \{\langle \rangle\} \text{ we have} \right. \\ \left. p \text{ is orthogonal to } N_{\eta^-} \text{ but not to } N_\eta \right\}.$$

**1.8 Definition.** 1) We say that  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$ , an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$ , is  $J$ -regular iff  $J \subseteq I$  and:

(\*) for each  $\eta \in I \setminus J$  there is  $c_\eta$  such that  $a_\eta \in \text{acl}(N_\eta + c_\eta)$   
 $\frac{c_\eta}{N_\eta}$  is regular and if  $\eta \neq \langle \rangle$  then  $\frac{a_\eta}{N_\eta + c_\eta} \perp_a N_{(\eta^-)}$ .

- 2) We say “ $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is a regular  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  [of  $M$ ]” if it is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  [of  $M$ ] which is  $\emptyset$ -regular.
- 3) We say “ $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is a regular  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  [of  $M$ ] over  $\binom{B}{A}$ ” iff it is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  [of  $M$ ] over  $\binom{B}{A}$  which is  $\{\langle \rangle\}$ -regular.

**1.9 Claim.** 1) Every  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated model has an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition (i.e. of it).

2) If  $M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated,  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$ , then for some  $J$ , and  $N_\eta, a_\eta$  for  $\eta \in J \setminus I$  we have:  $I \subseteq J$  and  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in J \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  (even an  $I$ -regular one).

3) If  $M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated,  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  then  $M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime and  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -minimal over  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta$ ; if in addition  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in \{\langle \rangle, \langle 0 \rangle\} \rangle$  is an

$\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ , then  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \ \& \ (\eta \neq \langle \rangle \rightarrow \langle 0 \rangle \leq \eta) \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ .

4) If  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ , then it is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$ .

5) If  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  [above  $\binom{B}{A}$ ],  $\eta \in I$ ,

- $[\eta \in I \setminus \{\langle \rangle\}], \alpha = \text{Min}\{\beta : \eta^\wedge \langle \beta \rangle \notin I\}, \nu =: \eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle, a_\nu \in M, \frac{a_\nu}{N_\eta}$  regular, orthogonal to  $\eta^-$  if  $\eta \neq \langle \rangle$ ,  $N_\nu \prec M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $N_\eta + a_\nu$  and  $a_\nu \amalg_{N_\eta} \left( \bigcup_{\rho \in I} N_\rho \right)$  (enough to demand  $\{a_\rho : \rho^- = \eta \text{ and } \rho \in I\}$  is independent over  $N_\eta$ ) then  $\langle N_\rho, a_\rho : \rho \in I \cup \{\nu\} \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  [above  $\binom{B}{A}$ ].
- 6) Assume  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$ , if  $p$  is regular stationary and is not orthogonal to  $M$  (e.g.  $p \in S(M)$ ) then for one and only one  $\eta \in I$ , there is a regular stationary  $q \in S(N_\eta)$  not orthogonal to  $p$  such that: if  $\eta^-$  is well defined (i.e.  $\eta \neq \langle \rangle$ ), then  $p \perp N_{\eta^-}$ .
- 7) Assume  $I = \bigcup_{\alpha < \alpha(*)} I_\alpha$ , for each  $\alpha$  we have  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I_\alpha \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  [above  $\binom{B}{A}$ ] and for each  $\eta \in I$  for every  $n < \omega$  and  $\nu_\ell = \eta^\wedge \langle \beta_\ell \rangle$  for  $\ell < n$ , for some  $\alpha$  we have:  $\{\nu_\ell : \ell < n\} \subseteq I_\alpha$  (e.g.  $I_\alpha$  increasing). Then  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  [above  $\binom{B}{A}$ ].
- 8) In (7), if  $\eta \neq \langle \rangle$  and some  $\nu_\ell$  is not  $\triangleleft$ -maximal in  $I$  and  $\frac{a_{\nu_\ell}}{N_\eta}$  is regular, it is enough:

$$\ell_1 < \ell_2 < n \Rightarrow \bigvee_{\alpha < \alpha(*)} [\{\nu_{\ell_1}, \nu_{\ell_2}\} \subseteq I_\alpha].$$

- 9) If  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$ ,  $I_1, I_2 \subseteq I$  are closed under initial segments and  $I_0 = I_1 \cap I_2$  then  $\left( \bigcup_{\eta \in I_1} N_\eta \right) \amalg_{\bigcup_{\eta \in I_0} N_\eta} \left( \bigcup_{\eta \in I_2} N_\eta \right)$ .
- 10) Assume that for  $\ell = 1, 2$  that  $\langle N_\eta^\ell, a_\eta^\ell : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M_\ell$ , and for  $\eta \in I$  the function  $f_\eta$  is an isomorphism from  $N_\eta^1$  onto  $N_\eta^2$  and  $\eta \triangleleft \nu \Rightarrow f_\eta \subseteq f_\nu$ . Then  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} f_\eta$  is an elementary mapping; if in addition  $\langle N_\eta^\ell, a_\eta^\ell : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M_\ell$  (for  $\ell = 1, 2$ ) then  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} f_\eta$  can be extended to an isomorphism from  $M_1$  onto  $M_2$ .
- 11) If  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  (above  $\binom{B}{A}$ ) and  $M^- \prec M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta$  then  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  (above  $\binom{B}{A}$ ).

*Proof.* 1), 2), 3), 5), 6), 9), 10). Repeat the proofs of [Sh:c, X]. (Note that here  $a_\eta/N_\eta$  is not necessarily regular, a minor change).

4), 7) Check.

8) As  $\text{Dp}(p) > 0 \Rightarrow p$  is trivial, by [Sh:c, ChX, 7.2, p.551] and [Sh:c, ChX, 7.3].  $\square_{1.9}$

We shall prove:



**1.10 Claim.** 1) If  $M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated,  $\binom{B}{A} \in \Gamma(M)$ , then there is  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$ , an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ .

2) Moreover if  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  satisfies clauses (a) – (h) of Definition 1.7(1), we can extend it to satisfy clause (i) of 1.7(2), too.

3) If  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ ,  $M^- \prec M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta$  then:

- (a)  $\langle N_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is a  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M^-$
- (b) we can find an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in J \rangle$  of  $M$  such that  $J \supseteq I$  and  $[\eta \in J \setminus I \Rightarrow (\eta \neq \langle \rangle \ \& \ \neg \langle 0 \rangle \triangleleft \eta)]$ , moreover the last phrase follows from the previous ones.

4) If in 3)(b) the set  $J \setminus I$  is countable (finite is enough for our applications), then necessarily  $M, M^-$  are isomorphic, even adding all members of an  $\epsilon$ -finite subset of  $M^-$  as individual constants.

5) If  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ ,  $I \subseteq J$  and  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in J \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$ ,  $M^- \prec M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta$

and  $\binom{B}{A} \leq^* \binom{B_1}{A_1}$  and  $B_1 \subseteq M$  and  $c \in M$  and  $\frac{c}{B_1} \perp A_1$  and  $\frac{c}{B_1}$  is (stationary and) regular then

- ( $\alpha$ )  $\frac{c}{B_1} \perp \frac{\bigcup \{N_\eta : \eta \in J \setminus I\}}{N_{\langle \rangle}}$
- ( $\beta$ )  $\frac{c}{B_1}$  is not orthogonal to some  $p \in \mathcal{P}(\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle, M^-)$ .

6) If  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$  and  $M^-$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta$ , then the set  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(\langle N_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle, M)$  depends on  $\binom{B}{A}$  and  $M$  only

(and not on  $\langle N_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  or  $M^-$ ), remember:

$$\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(\langle N_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle, M) = \left\{ p \in S(M) : p \text{ regular and for some } \eta \in I \setminus \{ \langle \rangle \}, \text{ we have : } \right. \\ \left. p \text{ is orthogonal to } N_{\eta^-} \text{ but not to } N_\eta \right\}.$$

So let  $\mathcal{P}(\binom{B}{A}, M) = \mathcal{P}(\langle N_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle, M)$ .

(7) If  $\frac{B}{A}$  is regular of depth zero or just  $\frac{b}{A} \leq_a \frac{B}{A}, \frac{b}{A}$  regular of depth zero and  $M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated and  $B \subseteq M$  then for any  $\alpha$ , we have  $tp_\alpha(\binom{B}{A}, M)$  depend just on  $tp_0(\binom{B}{A}, M)$ .

8) For  $\alpha < \beta$ , from  $tp_\beta(\binom{B}{A}, M)$  we can compute  $tp_\alpha(\binom{B}{A}, M)$ .

9) If  $f$  is an isomorphism from  $M_1$  onto  $M_2$ ,  $A_1 \subseteq B_1$  are  $\epsilon$ -finite subsets of  $M_1$  and  $f(A_1) = A_2, f(B_1) = B_2$  then

$$tp_\alpha\left(\binom{B_1}{A_1}, M_1\right) = tp_\alpha\left(\binom{B_2}{A_2}, M_2\right)$$

(more pedantically  $tp_\alpha((^{B_2}_{A_2}), M_2) = f[tp_\alpha((^{B_1}_{A_1}), M_1)]$  or considered the  $A_\ell, B_\ell$  as indexed sets).

We delay the proof (parts (1), (2), (3) are proved after 1.18, part (4), (6) after 1.19, and parts (5), (7), (8) after 1.20). Part (9) is obvious.

**1.11 Definition.** 1) If  $(^B_A) \in \Gamma(M)$ ,  $M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated let  $\mathcal{P}_{(^B_A)}^M$  be the set  $\mathcal{P}$  from Claim 1.10(6) above (by 1.10(6) this is well defined as we shall prove below).

2) Let  $\mathcal{P}_{(^B_A)} = \left\{ p : p \text{ is (stationary regular and) parallel to some } p' \in \mathcal{P}_{(^B_A)}^{\text{eq}} \right\}$ .

**1.12 Definition.** If  $\langle N_\eta^\ell, a_\eta : \eta \in J \rangle$  is a decomposition inside  $\mathfrak{C}$  for  $\ell = 1, 2$  we say that  $\langle N_\eta^1, a_\eta : \eta \in J \rangle \leq_{\text{direct}}^* \langle N_\eta^2, a_\eta : \eta \in J \rangle$  if:

- (a)  $N_\emptyset^1 \prec N_\emptyset^2$
- (b)  $N_\emptyset^2 \bigcup N_\emptyset^1 \bigcup \{a_{\langle \alpha \rangle} : \langle \alpha \rangle \in J\}$
- (c) for  $\eta \in J \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ ,  $N_\eta^2$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_\eta^1 \cup N_{\eta^-}^2$ .

**1.13 Claim.** 1)  $M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $A$  iff  $M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $A$  iff  $M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated,  $A \subseteq M$ , and for every  $\mathbf{I} \subseteq M$  indiscernible over  $A$  we have:  $\dim(\mathbf{I}, M) \leq \aleph_0$  iff  $M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated and for every finite  $A \subseteq M$  and regular (stationary)  $p \in S(A)$ , we have  $\dim(p, M) \leq \aleph_0$ .

2) If  $N_1, N_2$  are  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $A$ , then they are isomorphic over  $A$ .

*Proof.* By [Sh:c, IV,4.18] (see Definition [Sh:c, IV,4.16], noting that part (4) disappears when we are speaking on  $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^a$ ).

**1.14 Fact.** 0) If  $A$  is countable,  $N$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $A$  then  $N$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $\emptyset$ .

1) If  $N$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\emptyset$ ,  $A$  countable,  $N^+$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N \cup A$  then  $N^+$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\emptyset$ .

2) If  $\langle N_n : n < \omega \rangle$  is increasing, each  $N_n$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\emptyset$  or just  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -constructible and  $N_\omega$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n$  then  $N_\omega$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\emptyset$ , (note  $N_\omega = \bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n$ ).

3) If  $N_2 \bigcup_{N_0} N_1$ , each  $N_\ell$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated,  $N_2$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_0 \cup \bar{a}$ , and  $N_3$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_2 \cup N_1$  then  $N_3$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_1 \cup \bar{a}$ .

4) If  $N_1 \prec N_2$  are  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $\emptyset$  then for some  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated  $N_0 \prec N_1$  (necessarily  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $\emptyset$ ) we have:  $N_1, N_2$  are isomorphic over  $N_0$ .

5) In part (4), if  $A \subseteq N_1$  is  $\epsilon$ -finite we can demand  $A \subseteq N_0$ .

6) If  $M_0$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated,  $A \bigcup_{M_0} B$ ,  $M_1$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $M_0 \cup A$  then  $M_1 \bigcup_{M_0} B$ .

7) Assume  $N_0 \prec N_1 \prec N_2$  are  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated,  $N_2$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $N_1 + a$  and  $\frac{a}{N_1} \perp N_0$  (and  $a \notin N_1$ ). If  $N'_0 \prec N_0$ ,  $N'_0 \prec N'_1 \prec N_1$ ,  $N'_1 \bigcup_{N'_0} N_0$  and  $N_1$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $N'_0$

over  $N_0 \cup N'_1$ , then we can find  $a', N'_2$  such that:  $N'_2$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated,  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $N'_1 + a', N'_1 \prec N'_2 \prec N_2, N_1 \bigcup_{N'_1} N'_2$  and  $N'_2$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $N_1 \cup N'_2$ .

8) Assume  $N'_0 \prec N_0 \prec N_1$  and  $a \in N_1$  and  $N_1$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_0 + a$  and  $\frac{a}{N'_0} \pm N'_0$  then we can find  $a', N'_1$  such that  $a' \in N', N'_0 \prec N'_1 \prec N_1, N'_1 \bigcup_{N'_0} N_0, N'_1$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N'_0 + a$  and  $N_1$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_0 + N'_1$ .

9) If  $N_1$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated and  $A \subseteq B \subseteq N_1$  and  $A, B$  are  $\epsilon$ -finite, then we can find  $N_0$  such that:  $A \subseteq N_0 \prec N_1, N_0$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\emptyset, A \subseteq N_0, B \bigcup_A N_0$ , and  $N_1$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_0 \cup B$ .

10) If  $N_0$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $A$  and  $A, B \subseteq N_0$  are  $\epsilon$ -finite, then  $N_0$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $A \cup B$ .

*1.15 Remark.* In the proof of 1.14(1)-(6),(10) we do not use “ $T$  has NDOP”.

*Proof.* 0) There is  $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^*\}$  a list of the members of  $N$  such that for  $\alpha < \alpha^*$  we have:  $\text{tp}(a_\alpha, A \cup \{a_\beta : \beta < \alpha\})$  is  $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^a$ -isolated.

[Why? by the definition of “ $N$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $A$ ”. Let  $\{b_n : n < \omega\}$  list  $A$  (if  $A = \emptyset$  the conclusion is trivial so without loss of generality  $A \neq \emptyset$ , hence we can find such a sequence  $\{b_n : n < \omega\}$ ). Now define  $\beta^* = \omega + \beta$  and  $b_{\omega+\alpha} = a_\alpha$  for  $\alpha < \alpha^*$ . So  $\{b_\beta : \beta < \beta^*\}$  lists the elements of  $N$  (remember  $A \subseteq N$  and check). We claim that  $\text{tp}(b_\beta, \{b_\gamma : \gamma < \beta\})$  is  $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^a$ -isolated for  $\beta < \beta^*$ .

(Why? if  $\beta \geq \omega$ , let  $\beta' = \beta - \omega$  (so  $\beta < \alpha^*$ ), now the statement above means  $\text{tp}(a_{\beta'}, A \cup \{a_\gamma : \gamma < \beta'\})$  is  $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^a$ -isolated which we know; if  $\beta < \omega$  this statement is trivial). By the definition,  $N$  is  $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^a$ -primary over  $\emptyset$ .

1) Note

(\*)<sub>1</sub> if  $N$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $\emptyset$  and  $A \subseteq N$  is finite then  $N$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $A$  [why? see [Sh:c, IV, 3.12(3), p.180] (of course, using [Sh:c, IV, Table 1, p.169] for  $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^a$ ]

(\*)<sub>2</sub> if  $N$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $\emptyset, A \subseteq N$  is finite and  $p \in S^m(M)$  does not fork over  $A$  and  $p \upharpoonright A$  is stationary then for some  $\{\bar{a}_\ell : \ell < \omega\}$  we have:  $\bar{a}_\ell \in M$  realize  $p, \{\bar{a}_\ell : \ell < \omega\}$  is independent over  $A$  and  $p \upharpoonright (A \cup \bigcup_{\ell < \omega} \bar{a}_\ell) \vdash p$

[why? [Sh:c, IV, proof of 4.18] (i.e. by it and [Sh:c, 4.9(3), 4.11]) or let  $N'$  be  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $A \cup \bigcup_{\ell < \omega} \bar{a}_\ell$  and note:  $N'$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $A$  (proof like the one of 1.14(0)) but also  $N$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $A$  so by uniqueness of the  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary model  $N'$  is isomorphic to  $N$  over  $A$ , so without loss of generality  $N' = N$ ; and easily  $N'$  is as required].

Now we can prove 1.14(1), for any  $\bar{c} \in {}^{\omega>}A$ , we can find a finite  $B_a^1 \subseteq N$  such that  $\text{tp}(\bar{c}, N)$  does not fork over  $B_a^1$ , let  $\bar{b}_{\bar{c}} \in {}^{\omega>}N$  realize  $\text{stp}(\bar{a}, B_a^1)$  and let  $B_{\bar{c}} = B_a^1 \cup \bar{b}_{\bar{c}}$ , so  $\text{tp}(\bar{c}, N)$  does not fork over  $B_{\bar{c}}$  and  $\text{tp}(\bar{c}, B_{\bar{c}})$  is stationary, hence we can find  $\{\bar{a}_\ell^{\bar{c}} : \ell < \omega\}$  as in (\*)<sub>2</sub> (for  $\text{tp}(\bar{c}, B_{\bar{c}})$ ). Let  $A' = \cup\{B_{\bar{c}} : \bar{c} \in {}^{\omega>}A\} \cup \{\bar{a}_\ell^{\bar{c}} : \bar{c} \in {}^{\omega>}A \text{ and } \ell < \omega\}$ , so  $A'$  is a countable subset of  $N$  and  $\text{tp}_*(A, A') \vdash \text{tp}(A, N) = \text{stp}(A, N)$ . As  $N$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $\emptyset$  we can

find a sequence  $\langle d_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$  and  $\langle w_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$  such that  $N = \{d_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^*\}$  and  $w_\alpha \subseteq \alpha$  is finite and  $\text{stp}(d_\alpha, \{d_\beta : \beta \in w_\alpha\}) \vdash \text{stp}(d_\alpha, \{d_\beta : \beta < \alpha\})$  and  $\beta < \alpha \Rightarrow d_\beta \neq d_\alpha$ .

We can find a countable set  $W \subseteq \alpha^*$  such that  $A' \subseteq \{d_\alpha : \alpha \in W\}$  and  $\alpha \in W \Rightarrow w_\alpha \subseteq W$ . By [Sh:c, IV, §2, §3] without loss of generality  $W$  is an initial segment of  $\alpha^*$ .

Easily

$$\alpha < \alpha^* \ \& \ \alpha \notin W \Rightarrow \text{stp}(d_\alpha, \{d_\beta : \beta \in W_\alpha\}) \vdash \text{stp}(d_\alpha, A \cup \{d_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}).$$

As  $N^+$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $N \cup A$  we can find a list  $\{d_\alpha : \alpha \in [\alpha^*, \alpha^{**})\}$  of  $N^+ \setminus (N \cup A)$  such that  $\text{tp}(d_\alpha, N \cup A \cup \{d_\beta : \beta \in [\alpha^*, \alpha^{**})\})$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -isolated. So  $\langle d_\alpha : \alpha \notin W, \alpha < \alpha^{**} \rangle$  exemplifies that  $N^+$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $A \cup A'$ , hence by 1.14(1) we know that  $N^+$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $\emptyset$ .

2) By the characterization of “ $N$  is  $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^a$ -prime over  $A$ ” in 1.13).

In more detail we use the last condition in 1.13(1). Clearly  $N_\omega$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated (as it is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n$ . Suppose  $A \subseteq N_\omega$  is finite and  $p \in S(A)$  is stationary and regular.

Case 1:  $p$  not orthogonal to  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n$ .

So for some  $n < \omega$ ,  $p$  is not orthogonal to  $N_n$ , hence there is a regular  $p_1 \in S(N_n)$  such that  $p, p_1$  are not orthogonal. Let  $A_1 \subseteq N_n$  be finite such that  $p_1$  does not fork over  $A$  and  $p_1 \upharpoonright A_1$  is stationary. So by [Sh:c, V, §2] we know  $\dim(p, N_\omega) = \dim(p_1 \upharpoonright A_1, N_\omega)$ , hence it suffices to prove that the latter is  $\aleph_0$ . Now use [Sh:c, V, 1.16(3), p.237].

Case 2:  $p$  is orthogonal to  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n$ .

Note that if each  $N_n$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime then  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated hence  $N = \bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n$  hence this case does not arise.

Let  $B \subseteq \bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n$  be a finite set such that  $\text{tp}_*(A, \bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n)$  does not fork over  $B$  and  $\text{stp}_*(A, B) \vdash \text{stp}_*(A, \bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n)$ . Let  $q \in S(N_\omega)$  extend  $p$  and does not fork over  $A$  and let  $q_1 = q \upharpoonright (B \cup A)$  and  $q_2 = q \upharpoonright (\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n \cup A)$ . Now by the assumption of

our case  $q_1$  is orthogonal to  $\text{tp}_*(\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n, B)$  hence (see [Sh:c, V, §3])  $q_1 \perp q_2$  and let  $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^*\} \subseteq q_1(N)$  be maximal set independent over  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n \cup A$ , so  $|\alpha^*| \leq \aleph_0$

hence without loss of generality  $\alpha^* \leq \omega$  and  $q \upharpoonright (\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n \cup A \cup \{a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^*\}) \vdash q$ .

Also clearly  $\text{tp}_*(\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^*\}, A \cup B) \vdash \text{tp}_*(\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^*\}, A \cup \bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n)$ . Together  $\dim(q_1, N) \leq \aleph_0$  and clearly  $\dim(p, N) \leq \aleph_0 + \dim(q_1, N)$ , so we are done.

We can use a different proof, note:

- ⊗<sub>1</sub> if  $\kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) \geq \kappa_r(T)$  and  $B_\alpha$  is  $\mathbf{F}_\kappa^a$ -constructible over  $A$  for  $\alpha < \delta, \delta \leq \kappa$  and  $\alpha < \beta < \delta \Rightarrow B_\alpha \subseteq B_\beta$  then  $\bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} B_\alpha$  is  $\mathbf{F}_\kappa^a$ -constructible over  $A$
- [why? see [Sh:c, IV, §3], [Sh:c, IV, 5.6, p.207] for such arguments, assume  $\mathcal{A}_\alpha = \langle A, \langle a_i^\alpha : i < i_\alpha \rangle, \langle B_i^\alpha : i < i_\alpha \rangle \rangle$  is an  $\mathbf{F}_\kappa^a$ -construction. Without loss of generality  $i < j < i_\alpha \Rightarrow a_i^\alpha \neq a_j^\alpha$ , and choose by induction on  $\zeta, \langle u_\zeta^\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$  such that:  $u_\zeta^\alpha \subseteq i_\alpha, u_\zeta^\alpha$  increasing continuous in  $i, u_0^\alpha = \emptyset, |u_{\zeta+1}^\alpha \setminus u_\zeta^\alpha| \leq \kappa, u_\zeta^\alpha$  is  $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$ -closed and  $\alpha < \beta < \delta$  implies  $\{a_j^\alpha : j \in u_\zeta^\alpha\} \subseteq \{a_j^\beta : j \in u_\zeta^\beta\}$  and  $\text{tp}_*(\{a_i^\beta : i \in u_\zeta^\beta\}, A \cup \{a_i^\alpha : i < i_\alpha\})$  does not fork over  $A \cup \{a_i^\alpha : i \in u_\zeta^\alpha\}$ ].

We use ⊗<sub>1</sub> for  $\kappa = \aleph_0$ .

So each  $N_n$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -constructible over  $\emptyset$  hence  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -constructible over  $\emptyset$  and

also  $N_\omega$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -constructible over  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n$  hence  $N_\omega$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -constructible over  $\emptyset$ . But  $N_\omega$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated hence  $N_\omega$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $\emptyset$ .

3) Suppose  $N'_3$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated and  $N_1 + \bar{a} \subseteq N'_3$ . As  $N_2$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_0 + \bar{a}$  and  $N_0 + \bar{a} \subseteq N_1 + \bar{a} \subseteq N'_3$  we can find an elementary embedding  $f_0$  of  $N_2$  into  $N'_3$  extending  $\text{id}_{N_0 + \bar{a}}$ . By [Sh:c, V, 3.3], the function  $f_1 = f_0 \cup \text{id}_{N_1}$  is an elementary mapping so  $\text{Dom}(f_1) = N_1 \cup N_2$ . As  $N_3$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_1 \cup N_2$  and  $f_1$  is an elementary mapping from  $N_1 \cup N_2$  into  $N'_3$  which is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated model there is an elementary embedding  $f_3$  of  $N_3$  into  $N'_3$  extending  $f_2$ . So as for any such  $N'_3$  there is such  $f_3$  clearly  $N_3$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_1 + \bar{a}$ , as required.

4) Essentially by [Sh 225].

Let  $N_0$  be  $\aleph_0$ -prime over  $\emptyset$  and let  $\{p_i : i < \alpha\} \subseteq S(N_0)$  be a maximal family of pairwise orthogonal regular types. Let  $\mathbf{I}_i = \{\bar{a}_n^i : n < \omega\} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$  be an independent set of elements realizing  $p_i$  and let  $\mathbf{I} = \bigcup_{i < \alpha} \mathbf{I}_i$  and  $N'_1$  be  $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^a$ -prime over  $N_0 \cup \mathbf{I}$ .

Now

(\*) if  $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \subseteq N'_1$  and  $\bar{a}/\bar{b}$  is regular, then  $\dim(\bar{a}/\bar{b}, N'_1) \leq \aleph_0$ .

[Why? If  $\bar{a}/\bar{b} \perp N_0$  then  $\dim(\bar{a}/\bar{b}, N'_1) \leq \aleph_0$  by [Sh 225, 1.2]. If  $\bar{b}/\bar{a} \perp N_0$ , then for some  $\bar{b}' \hat{\wedge} \bar{a}' \subseteq N_0$  realizing  $\text{stp}(\bar{b}' \hat{\wedge} \bar{a}', \emptyset)$ , we have  $\bar{a}'/\bar{b}' \perp \bar{a}/\bar{b}$  hence  $\dim(\bar{a}/\bar{b}, N'_1) = \dim(\bar{a}'/\bar{b}', N'_1)$ , so without loss of generality  $\bar{b}' \hat{\wedge} \bar{a} \subseteq N_0$ , similarly without loss of generality there is  $i(*) < \alpha$  such that  $\bar{b}/\bar{a} \subseteq p_{i(*)}$  and easily  $\dim(\bar{b}/\bar{a}, N'_1) = \dim(\bar{b}/\bar{a}, N_0) + \dim(p_{i(*)}, N_0) \leq \aleph_0 + \aleph_0 = \aleph_0$  (see [Sh:c, V, 1.6(3)]). So we have proved (\*).]

Now use 1.13(1) to deduce:  $N'_1$  is  $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_\epsilon}^a$ -prime over  $\emptyset$  hence (by uniqueness of  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime model, 1.13(2))  $N'_1 \cong N_1$ .

By renaming without a loss of generality  $N'_1 = N_1$ . Now

(\*\*)  $(N_1, c)_{c \in N_0}, (N_2, c)_{c \in N_0}$  are  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated and for if:  $\bar{a} \in \mathfrak{C}, \bar{b} \in N_\ell, \bar{a}/\bar{b}$  a regular type and  $\bar{a} \bigcup (\bar{b} \cup N_0)$  (for  $\ell = 1$  or  $\ell = 2$ ), then

$$\dim(\bar{a}/(\bar{b} \cup N_0), N_\ell) = \aleph_0.$$

[Why? Remember that we work in  $(\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}, c)_{c \in N_0}$ . The “ $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated” follows from the second statement.

Note:  $\dim(\bar{a}/(\bar{b} \cup N_0), N_\ell) \leq \dim(\bar{a}/\bar{b}, N_\ell) \leq \aleph_0$  (first inequality by monotonicity, second inequality by 1.13(1) and the assumption “ $N_\ell$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\emptyset$ ”). If  $\bar{a}/\bar{b}$  is not orthogonal to  $N_0$  then for some  $i < \alpha$  we have  $p_i \pm (\bar{a}/\bar{b})$  so easily (using “ $N_\ell$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated”) we have  $\dim(\bar{a}/(\bar{b} \cup N_0), N_0) = \dim(p_i, N_\ell) \geq \|\mathbf{I}_i\| = \aleph_0$ ; so together with the previous sentence we get equality. Lastly, if  $\bar{a}/\bar{b} \perp N_0$  by [Sh 225, 1.1, p.280], we have  $\dim(\bar{a}/(\bar{b} \cup N_0), N_\ell) < \aleph_0 \Rightarrow \dim(\bar{a}/\bar{b}, N_\ell) < \aleph_0$  which contradicts the assumption “ $N_\ell$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated”. So we have proved  $(**)$  hence by 1.13(1) we get “ $N_1, N_2$  are isomorphic over  $N_0$  as required.

5) This is proved similarly.

6) By [Sh:c, V, 3.2].

7) As  $N_1$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_0 \cup N'_1$  and as  $T$  has NDOP (i.e. does not have DOP) we know (by [Sh:c, X, 2.1, 2.2, p.512]) that  $N_1$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -minimal over  $N_0 \cup N'_1$  and  $\frac{a}{N_1}$  is not orthogonal to  $N_0$  or to  $N'_1$ . But  $a/N_1 \perp N_0$  by an assumption, so  $a/N_1$  is not orthogonal to  $N'_1$  hence there is a regular  $p' \in S(N'_1)$  not orthogonal to  $\frac{a}{N_1}$  hence (by [Sh:c, V, 1.12, p.236])  $p'$  is realized say by  $a' \in N_2$ . By [Sh:c, V, 3.3], we know that  $N_2$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_1 + a'$ . We can find  $N'_2$  which is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N'_1 + a'$  such that  $N_2$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_1 \cup N'_2$  (by uniqueness, i.e. 1.13(1)), so we have finished.

8) Similar easier proof.

9) Let  $N'_0$  be  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $A$  such that  $B \bigcup_A N'_0$ , and let  $N'_1$  be  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N'_0 \cup B$ . By 1.14(1), we know that  $N'_1$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\emptyset$ , and by 1.14(10) below  $N'_1$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $A \cup B$ , hence by 1.13(2) we know that  $N'_1, N_1$  are isomorphic over  $A \cup B$  hence without loss of generality  $N'_1 = N_1$  and so  $N_0 = N'_0$  is as required.

10) By [Sh:c, IV, 3.12(3), p.180].  $\square_{1.14}$

**1.16 Fact.** Assume  $\langle N_\eta^1, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle \leq_{\text{direct}}^* \langle N_\eta^2, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  (see Definition 1.12) and  $A \subseteq B \subseteq N_{<0}^1$  and  $\bigwedge_{\eta \in I} N_\eta^2 \prec M$ .

(1) If  $\nu = \eta \hat{ } \langle \alpha \rangle \in I$ , then  $N_\eta^2 \bigcup_{N_\eta^1} N_\nu^1$  and even  $N_\eta^2 \bigcup_{N_\eta^1} \left( \bigcup_{\substack{\rho \in I \\ \neg \eta \hat{ } \rho}} N_\rho^1 \right)$ ; and

$\eta \hat{ } \nu \in I$  implies  $N_\nu^2 \bigcup_{N_\eta^1} \left( \bigcup_{\substack{\rho \in I \\ \neg \eta \hat{ } \rho}} N_\rho^1 \right)$ .

- (2)  $\langle N_\eta^2, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$  iff  $\langle N_\eta^1, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ .
- (3) Similarly replacing “ $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ ” by “ $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ ”.

*Proof.* 1) We prove the first statement by induction on  $\ell g(\eta)$ . If  $\eta = \langle \rangle$  this is clause (b) by the Definition 1.12 and clause (d) of Definition 1.7(1) (and [Sh:c, V, 3.2]). If  $\eta \neq \langle \rangle$ , then  $\frac{a_\eta}{N_\eta} \perp N_{(\eta-)}^1$  (by condition (e) of Definition 1.7(1)).

By the induction hypothesis  $N_{(\eta^-)}^2 \bigcup_{N_{(\eta^-)}^1} N_\eta^1$  and we know  $N_\eta^2$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over

$N_{(\eta^-)}^2 \cup N_\eta^1$ ; we know this implies no  $p \in S(N_\eta^1)$  orthogonal to  $N_{\eta^-}^1$  is realized in  $N_\eta^2$  hence  $\frac{a_\nu}{N_\eta^1} \perp \frac{N_\eta^2}{N_\eta^1}$ , so  $\frac{a_\nu}{N_\eta^1} \vdash \frac{a_\nu}{N_\eta^2}$  hence  $\frac{N_\eta^1}{N_\eta^1} \perp \frac{N_\eta^2}{N_\eta^1}$  hence  $N_\nu^1 \bigcup_{N_\eta^1} N_\eta^2$  as required. The

other statements hold by the non-forking calculus (remember if  $\eta = \nu \hat{\ } \langle \alpha \rangle \in I$  then use  $\text{tp}(\bigcup \{N_\rho^1 : \eta \trianglelefteq \rho \in I\}, N_\eta^1)$  is orthogonal to  $N_\nu^1$  or see details in the proof of 1.17(1)( $\alpha$ )).

2) By Definition 1.12, for  $\ell = 1, 2$  we have:  $\langle N_\eta^\ell, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is a decomposition inside  $\mathfrak{C}$  and by assumption  $\bigwedge_{\eta \in I} N_\eta^1 \prec N_\eta^2 \prec M$ . So for  $\ell = 1, 2$  we have to prove

“ $\langle N_\eta^\ell, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  for  $\binom{B}{A}$ ” assuming this holds for  $1 - \ell$ . We have to check Definition 1.7(1).

Clauses 1.5(1)(a),(b) for  $\ell$  holds because they hold for  $1 - \ell$ .

Clause 1.5(1)(c) holds as by the assumptions  $A \subseteq B \subseteq N_{<0>}^1 \prec N_{<0>}^2$  and  $N_{<0>}^1 \bigcup_{N_{<0>}^1} N_{<0>}^2$ .

Clauses 1.5(1)(d),(e),(f),(h) holds as  $\langle N_\eta^\ell, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is a decomposition inside  $\mathfrak{C}$  (for  $\ell = 1$  given, for  $\ell = 2$  easily checked).

Clause 1.5(1)(g) holds as  $\bigwedge_{\eta} N_\eta^1 \prec N_\eta^2 \prec M$  is given and  $M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated.

3) First we do the “only if” direction; i.e. prove the maximality of  $\langle N_\eta^1, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  as an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$  for  $\binom{B}{A}$  (i.e. condition (i) from 1.7(2)), assuming it holds for  $\langle N_\eta^2, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$ . If this fails, then for some  $\eta \in I \setminus \{<>\}$  and  $a \in M$ ,  $\{a_{\eta \hat{\ } <\alpha>} : \eta \hat{\ } <\alpha> \in I\} \cup \{a\}$  is independent over  $N_\eta^1$  and  $a \notin \{a_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle \alpha \rangle} : \eta \hat{\ } \langle \alpha \rangle \in I\}$  and  $\frac{a}{N_\eta^1} \perp N_{\eta^-}^1$ . Hence, if  $\eta \hat{\ } \langle \alpha_\ell \rangle \in I$  for  $\ell < k$  then  $\bar{a} = \langle a \rangle \hat{\ } \langle a_{\eta \hat{\ } <\ell>} : \ell < k \rangle$  realizes over  $N_\eta^1$  a type orthogonal to  $N_{\eta^-}^1$ , but  $N_{\eta^-}^1 \prec N_\eta^1, N_{\eta^-}^1 \prec N_{\eta^-}^2$  and  $N_\eta^1 \bigcup_{N_{\eta^-}^1} N_\eta^2$  (see 1.16(1), hence [Sh:c, V,2.8])

$\text{tp}(\bar{a}, N_\eta^2) \perp N_{\eta^-}^2$  hence  $\{a\} \cup \{a_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle \ell \rangle} : \ell < k\}$  is independent over  $N_\eta^2$  but  $k, \eta \hat{\ } \langle \alpha_\ell \rangle$  were arbitrary so  $\{a\} \cup \{a_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle \alpha \rangle} : \eta \hat{\ } \langle \alpha \rangle \in I\}$  is independent over  $N_\eta^2$  contradicting condition (i) from Definition 1.7(2) for  $\langle N_\eta^2, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$ .

For the other direction use: if the conclusion fails, then for some  $\eta \in I \setminus \{<>\}$  and  $a \in M$  the set  $\{a_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle \alpha \rangle} : \eta \hat{\ } \langle \alpha \rangle \in I\} \cup \{a\}$  is independent of  $N_\eta^1$ .  $\square_{1.16}$

*1.17 Fact.* Assume  $\langle N_\eta^1, a_\eta^1 : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition inside  $M$ .

1) If  $N_{<>}^1 \prec N_{<>}^2 \prec M, N_\eta^2$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\emptyset$  and

$N_{<>}^2 \bigcup_{N_{<>}^1} \{a_{<\alpha>}^1 : <\alpha> \in I\}$  then

$$(\alpha) \left[ N_{<>}^2 \bigcup_{N_{<>}^1} \bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta^1 \right] \text{ and}$$

( $\beta$ ) we can find  $N_\eta^2 (\eta \in I \setminus \{<>\})$  such that  $N_\eta^2 \prec M$ , and

$$\langle N_\eta^1, a_\eta^1 : \eta \in I \rangle \leq_{\text{direct}}^* \langle N_\eta^2, a_\eta^1 : \eta \in I \rangle.$$

2) If  $Cb \frac{a^1_{<\alpha>}}{N^1_{<\alpha>}} \subseteq N^0_{<\alpha>} \prec N^1_{<\alpha>}$  or at least  $N^0_{<\alpha>} \prec N^1_{<\alpha>}$  and  $\frac{a^1_{<\alpha>}}{N^1_{<\alpha>}} \pm N^0_{<\alpha>}$  whenever  $<\alpha> \in I$  then we can find  $N^0_\eta \prec M$  and  $a^0_\eta \in N_\eta$  (for  $\eta \in I \setminus \{<\alpha>\}$ ) such that  $\langle N^0_\eta, a^0_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle \leq^*_{\text{direct}} \langle N^1_\eta, a^1_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$ .

*Proof.* 1) For proving  $(\alpha)$  let  $\{\eta_i : i < i^*\}$  list the set  $I$  such that  $\eta_i \triangleleft \eta_j \Rightarrow i < j$ , so  $\eta_0 = <\alpha>$  and without loss of generality for some  $\alpha^*$  we have  $\eta_i \in \{<\alpha> : <\alpha> \in I\} \Leftrightarrow i \in [1, \alpha^*)$ . Now we prove by induction on  $\beta \in [1, \alpha^*)$  that  $N^2_{<\alpha>} \bigcup_{i < \beta} \{N^1_{\eta_i} : i < \beta\}$ . For  $\beta = 1$  this is assumed. For  $\beta$  limit use the local character of non-forking.

If  $\beta = \gamma + 1 \in [1, \alpha^*)$ , then by repeated use of [Sh:c, V, 3.2] (as  $\{a_{\eta_0} : j \in [1, \beta]\}$  is independent over  $(N^1_{<\alpha>}, N^2_{<\alpha>})$  and  $N^1_{<\alpha>}$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated and  $N^1_{\eta_j} (j \in [1, \gamma])$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N^1_{<\alpha>} + a_{\eta_j}$ ) we know that  $\text{tp}(a_{\eta_\gamma}, N^2_{<\alpha>} \cup \bigcup_{i < \gamma} N^1_{\eta_i})$  does not fork over

$N^1_{<\alpha>}$ . Again by [Sh:c, V, 3.2],  $\text{tp}_*(N^1_{\eta_\gamma}, N^2_{<\alpha>} \cup \bigcup_{i < \gamma} N^1_{\eta_i})$  does not fork over  $N^1_{<\alpha>}$

hence  $\bigcup_{i < \beta} N^1_{\eta_i} \bigcup_{N^1_{<\alpha>}} N^2_{<\alpha>}$  and use symmetry.

Lastly, if  $\beta \in \gamma + 1 \in [\alpha^*, i^*)$ ,  $\text{tp}(a_{\eta_\gamma}, N_{\eta_\gamma})$  is orthogonal to  $N^1_{<\alpha>}$  and even to  $N^1_{(\eta_\gamma)^-}$  so again by non-forking and [Sh:c, V, 3.2] we can do it, so clause  $(\alpha)$  holds.

For clause  $(\beta)$ , we choose  $N^2_{\eta_i}$  for  $i \in [1, i^*)$  by induction on  $i < i^*$  such that  $N^2_{\eta_i} \prec M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N^2_{\eta_i^-} \cup N^1_{\eta_i}$ . By the non-forking calculus we can check Definition 1.5.

2) We let  $\{\eta_i : i < i^*\}$  be as above, now we choose by induction on  $i \in [1, i^*)$   $N^0_{\eta_i}, a^0_{\eta_i}$  such that:

- (\*)  $N^0_{\eta_i} \prec N^1_{\eta_i}$  and  $\bigcup_{N^0_{\eta_i^-}} N^1_{\eta_i}$  and  $N^1_{\eta_i}$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N^0_{\eta_i} \cup N^1_{\eta_i^-}$
- (\*\*)  $a^0_{\eta_i} \in N^0_{\eta_i}$  and  $N^0_{\eta_i}$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N^0_{\eta_i^-} \pm a^0_{\eta_i}$ .

The induction step is done: if  $\ell g(\eta_i) > 1$  by 1.14(7) and if  $\ell g(\eta_i) = 1$  by 1.14(8).  $\square_{1.17}$

**1.18 Fact.** 1) If  $\langle N^1_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle \leq^*_{\text{direct}} \langle N^2_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  both  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decompositions inside  $M$  then

$$\mathcal{P}(\langle N^1_\eta, a^1_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle, M) = \mathcal{P}(\langle N^2_\eta, a^2_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle, M).$$

*Proof.* By Definition 1.7(5) it suffices to prove, for each  $\eta \in I \setminus \{<\alpha>\}$  that

- (\*) for regular  $p \in S(M)$  we have  $p \perp N^1_{\eta^-}$  &  $p \pm N^1_\eta \Leftrightarrow p \pm N^2_{\eta^-}$  &  $p \pm N^2_\eta$ .



Now for regular  $p \in S(M)$ : first assume  $p \perp N_{\eta-}^1$  &  $p \pm N_{\eta}^1$  so  $p \pm N_{\eta}^2$  (as  $N_{\eta}^1 \prec N_{\eta}^2$  and  $p \pm N_{\eta}^1$ ) and we can find a regular  $q \in S(N_{\eta}^1)$  such that  $q \pm p$ ; so  $q \perp N_{\eta-}^1$ , now  $q \perp N_{\eta-}^2$  (as  $N_{\eta}^1 \bigcup_{N_{\eta-}^1} N_{\eta-}^2$  and  $q \perp N_{\eta}^1$  see [Sh:c, V,2.8]) hence  $p \perp N_{\eta-}^2$ .

Second, assume  $p \perp N_{\eta-}^2$  &  $p \pm N_{\eta}^2$ , remember  $N_{\eta-}^1, N_{\eta}^1, N_{\eta}^2, N_{\eta}^3$  are  $\aleph_{\epsilon}$ -saturated,  $N_{\eta}^1 \bigcup_{N_{\eta-}^1} N_{\eta-}^2$  and  $N_{\eta}^2$  is  $\aleph_{\epsilon}$ -prime over  $N_{\eta}^1 \cup N_{\eta-}^2$  and  $T$  does not have

DOP. Clearly  $N_{\eta}^2$  is  $\aleph_{\epsilon}$ -minimal over  $N_{\eta}^1 \cup N_{\eta-}^2$  and every regular  $q \in S(N_{\eta}^2)$  is not orthogonal to  $N_{\eta}^1$  or to  $N_{\eta-}^2$ . Also as  $p \pm N_{\eta}^2$  there is a regular  $q \in S(N_{\eta}^2)$  not orthogonal to  $p$ , so as  $p \perp N_{\eta-}^2$  also  $q \perp N_{\eta-}^2$ ; hence by the previous sentence  $q \pm N_{\eta}^1$  hence  $p \pm N_{\eta}^1$ . Lastly, as  $p \perp N_{\eta-}^2$  and  $N_{\eta-}^1 \prec N_{\eta-}^2$  clearly  $p \perp N_{\eta-}^1$ , as required.  $\square_{1.18}$

At last we start proving 1.10.

*Proof of 1.10.* 1) Let  $N^0 \prec \mathfrak{C}$  be  $\aleph_{\epsilon}$ -primary over  $A$ , without loss of generality  $N^0 \bigcup_A B$  (but not necessarily  $N^0 \prec M$ ), and let  $N^1$  be  $\aleph_{\epsilon}$ -primary over  $N^0 \cup B$ .

Now by 1.14(0) the model  $N^0$  is  $\aleph_{\epsilon}$ -primary over  $\emptyset$  and by 1.14(1) the model  $N^1$  is  $\aleph_{\epsilon}$ -primary over  $\emptyset$  hence (by 1.14(10)) is  $\aleph_{\epsilon}$ -primary over  $B$ , hence without loss of generality  $N^1 \prec M$ . Let  $N_{<} = N^0, N_{<0} = N^1, I = \{<, <0>\}$  and  $a_{<0} = B$ . More exactly  $a_{\eta}$  is such that  $\text{dcl}(\{a_{\eta}\}) = \text{dcl}(B)$ . Clearly  $\langle N_{\eta}, a_{\eta} : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_{\epsilon}$ -decomposition inside  $M$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ . Now apply part (2) of 1.10 proved below.

2) By 1.9(4) we know  $\langle N_{\eta}, a_{\eta} : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_{\epsilon}$ -decomposition inside  $M$ , by 1.14(2) we then find  $J \supseteq I$  and  $N_{\eta}, a_{\eta}$  for  $\eta \in J \setminus I$  such that  $\langle N_{\eta}, a_{\eta} : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_{\epsilon}$ -decomposition of  $M$ . By 1.14(3),  $\langle N_{\eta}, a_{\eta} : \eta \in J' \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_{\epsilon}$ -decomposition of  $M$  for  $\binom{B}{A}$  where  $J' = \{\eta \in J : \eta = <> \text{ or } \langle 0 \rangle \leq \eta \in J\}$ .

3) Part (a) holds by 1.9(2),(3). As for part (b) by 1.9(2) there is  $\langle N_{\eta}, a_{\eta} : \eta \in J \rangle$ , an  $\aleph_{\epsilon}$ -decomposition of  $M$  with  $I \subseteq J$ ; easily  $\langle \langle 0 \rangle \leq \eta \in J \Rightarrow \eta \in I \rangle$ .

$\square_{1.10(1),(2),(3)}$

**1.19 Fact.** If  $\langle N_{\eta}^{\ell}, a_{\eta}^{\ell} : \eta \in I^{\ell} \rangle$  are  $\aleph_{\epsilon}$ -decompositions of  $M$  for  $\binom{B}{A}$ , for  $\ell = 1, 2$  and  $N_{<}^1 = N_{<}^2$  then  $\mathcal{P}(\langle N_{\eta}^1, a_{\eta}^1 : \eta \in I^1 \rangle, M) = \mathcal{P}(\langle N_{\eta}^2, a_{\eta}^2 : \eta \in I^2 \rangle, M)$ .

*Proof.* By 1.10(3)(b) we can find  $J^1 \supseteq I^1$  and  $N_{\eta}^1, a_{\eta}^1$  for  $\eta \in J^1 \setminus I^1$  such that  $\langle N_{\eta}^1, a_{\eta}^1 : \eta \in J^1 \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_{\epsilon}$ -decomposition of  $M$ . So  $\eta \in J^1 \setminus I^1 \Leftrightarrow \eta \neq \langle \rangle$  &  $\neg(\langle 0 \rangle \triangleleft \eta)$ . Let  $J^2 = I^2 \cup (J^1 \setminus I^1)$  and for  $\eta \in J^2 \setminus I^2$  let  $a_{\eta}^2 =: a_{\eta}^1, N_{\eta}^2 =: N_{\eta}^1$ . Easily  $\langle N_{\eta}^2, a_{\eta}^2 : \eta \in J^2 \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_{\epsilon}$ -decomposition of  $M$ . By 1.9(6) we know that for every regular  $p \in S(M)$  there is (for  $\ell = 1, 2$ ) a unique  $\eta(p, \ell) \in J^{\ell}$  such that  $p \perp N_{\eta(p, \ell)}^{\ell}$  &  $p \perp N_{\eta(p, \ell)-}^{\ell}$  (note  $\langle \rangle^-$  – meaningless). By the uniqueness of  $\eta(p, \ell)$ , if  $\eta(p, 1) \in J^1 \setminus I^1$  then as it can serve as  $\eta(p, 2)$  clearly it is  $\eta(p, 2)$  so  $\eta(p, 2) = \eta(p, 1) \in J^1 \setminus I^1 = J^2 \setminus I^2$ ; similarly  $\eta(p, 2) \in J^2 \setminus I^2 \Rightarrow \eta(p, 1) \in J^1 \setminus I^1$  and  $\eta(p, 1) = \langle \rangle \Leftrightarrow \eta(p, 2) = \langle \rangle$ . So

$$(*) \quad \eta(p, 1) \in I^1 \setminus \{\langle \rangle\} \Leftrightarrow \eta(p, 2) \in I^2 \setminus \{\langle \rangle\}.$$

But

$$(**) \quad \eta(p, \ell) \in I^\ell \setminus \{\langle \rangle\} \Leftrightarrow p \in \mathcal{P}(\langle N_\eta^\ell, a_\eta^\ell : \eta \in I^\ell \rangle, M).$$

Together we finish.  $\square_{1.19}$

We continue proving 1.10.

*Proof of 1.10(4).* Let  $N_\eta^1 = N_\eta$  and  $a_\eta^1 = a_\eta$  for  $\eta \in I$  and without loss of generality  $J \neq I$  hence  $J \setminus I \neq \emptyset$ .

Let  $N_{<>}^2 \prec M$  be  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\bigcup_{\nu \in J \setminus I} N_\nu$ ; letting  $J \setminus I = \{\eta_i : i < i^*\}$  be such that  $[\eta_i \triangleleft \eta_j \Rightarrow i < j]$  we can find  $N_{<>,i}^2$  (for  $i \leq i^*$ ) increasing continuous,  $N_{<>,0}^2 = N_{<>}^2$  and  $N_{<>,i+1}^2$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_{<>,i}^2 \cup N_{\eta_i}$  hence over  $N_{<>,i}^2 \cup a_{\eta_i}$ . Lastly, let  $N_{<>,i^*}^2 = N_{<>}^2$ .

By 1.14(1),(2) we know  $N_{<>}^2$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $\emptyset$  and (using repeatedly 1.14(6) + finite character of forking) we have  $N_{<>}^2 \bigcup_{N_{<>}^1} a_{<0>}$ . By 1.14(4)

(with  $N_{<>}^1, N_{<>}^2, Cb(a_{<>}/N_{<>}^1)$  here standing for  $N_1, N_2, A$  there) we can find a model  $N_{<>}^0$  such that  $a_{<0>} \bigcup_{N_{<>}^0} N_{<>}^1$  and  $Cb(a_{<>}/N_{<>}^1) \subseteq N_{<>}^0, N_{<>}^0 \prec N_{<>}^1, N_{<>}^0$

is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $\emptyset$  and  $N_{<>}^1, N_{<>}^2$  are isomorphic over  $N_{<>}^0$ . By 1.17(1) we can choose  $N_\eta^2 \prec M$  with  $N_\eta^1 \prec N_\eta^2$  and  $\langle N_\eta^1, a_\eta^1 : \eta \in I \rangle \leq_{\text{direct}}^* \langle N_\eta^2, a_\eta^1 : \eta \in I \rangle$ . Similarly, by 1.17(2) (here  $\text{Suc}_I(<>) = \{\langle 0 \rangle\}$ ) we can choose an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition  $\langle N_\eta^0, a_\eta^0 : \eta \in I \rangle$  with  $\langle N_\eta^0, a_\eta^0 : \eta \in I \rangle \leq_{\text{direct}}^* \langle N_\eta^1, a_\eta^1 : \eta \in I \rangle$ . By 1.10(3) we know that  $\langle N_\eta^1, a_\eta^1 : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M^-$  and easily  $\langle N_\eta^2, a_\eta^1 : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$ . Now choose by induction on  $\eta \in I$  an isomorphism  $f_\eta$  from  $N_\eta^1$  onto  $N_\eta^2$  over  $N_\eta^0$  such that  $\nu \triangleleft \eta \Rightarrow f_\nu \subseteq f_\eta$ . For  $\eta = <>$  we have chosen  $N_\eta^0$  such that  $N_\eta^1, N_\eta^2$  are isomorphic over  $N_\eta^0$ . For the induction step note that  $f_{(\eta^-)} \cup \text{id}_{N_\eta^0}$  is an elementary mapping as  $N_{(\eta^-)}^2 \bigcup_{N_{(\eta^-)}^0} N_\eta^0$  and  $f_{(\eta^-)} \cup \text{id}_{N_\eta^0}$  can be

extended to an isomorphism  $f_\eta$  from  $N_\eta^1$  onto  $N_\eta^2$  as  $N_\eta^\ell$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary (in fact even  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -minimal) over  $N_{(\eta^-)}^\ell \cup N_\eta^0$  for  $\ell = 1, 2$  (which holds easily). Now by 1.9(3) the model  $M^-$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated and  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary and  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -minimal over  $\bigcup_{\eta \in J} N_\eta = \bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta^1$ ;

similarly  $M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta^2$ . Now  $\bigcup_{\eta} f_\eta$  is an elementary mapping from

$\bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta^1$  onto  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta^2$  hence can be extended to an isomorphism  $f$  from  $M^-$  into  $M$ .

By the  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -minimality of  $M$  over  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta$  (see 1.9(3)),  $f$  is onto  $M$ , so  $f$  is as required.

$\square_{1.10(4)}$

We delay the proof of 1.10(5).

*Proof of 1.10(6).* Let  $\langle N_\eta^\ell, a_\eta : \eta \in I^\ell \rangle$  for  $\ell = 1, 2$ , be  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decompositions of  $M$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ , so  $\text{dcl}(a_{<>}^\ell) = \text{dcl}(B)$ . Let  $p \in S(M)$ , and assume that  $p \in \mathcal{P}(\langle N_\eta^1, a_\eta^1 : \eta \in I^1 \rangle, M)$ , i.e. for some  $\eta \in I^1 \setminus \{<>\}$ ,  $(p_\eta \perp N_{\eta^-})$  &  $p_\eta \pm N_\eta$ . We shall

prove that the situation is similar for  $\ell = 2$ ; i.e.  $p \in \mathcal{P}(\langle N_\eta^2, a_\eta^2 : \eta \in I^2 \rangle, M)$ ; by symmetry this suffices.

Let  $n = \ell g(\eta)$ , choose  $\langle B_\ell : \ell \leq n \rangle$  such that:

- ( $\alpha$ )  $A \subseteq B_0$ ,
- ( $\beta$ )  $B \subseteq B_1$ ,
- ( $\gamma$ )  $a_{\eta \upharpoonright \ell} \subseteq B_\ell \subseteq N_{\eta \upharpoonright \ell}^1$ , for  $\ell \leq n$
- ( $\delta$ )  $B_{\ell+1} \bigcup_{B_\ell} N_{\eta \upharpoonright \ell}^1$ ,
- ( $\epsilon$ )  $\frac{B_{\ell+1}}{B_\ell + a_{\eta \upharpoonright (\ell+1)}^1} \vdash \frac{B_{\ell+1}}{N_{\eta \upharpoonright \ell}^1 + a_{\eta \upharpoonright (\ell+1)}^1}$ ,
- ( $\zeta$ ) for some  $d \in B_n$ ,  $\frac{d}{B_n \setminus \{d\}}$  is regular  $\perp p$ , (hence  $\perp B_{n-1}$ )
- ( $\eta$ )  $B_\ell$  is  $\epsilon$ -finite.

[Why?  $\langle B_\ell : \ell \leq n \rangle$  exists? Prove by induction on  $n$  that for any  $\eta \in I$  of length  $n$  and  $\epsilon$ -finite  $B' \subseteq N_\eta$ , there is  $\langle B_\ell : \ell \leq n \rangle$  satisfying ( $\alpha$ ) – ( $\epsilon$ ), ( $\eta$ ) such that  $B' \subseteq B_n$ . Now there is  $p' \in S(N_\eta^1)$  regular not orthogonal to  $p$ , let  $B^1 \subseteq N_\eta^1$  be an  $\epsilon$ -finite set extending  $Cb(p')$ . Applying the previous sentence to  $\eta$ ,  $B^1$  we get  $\langle B_\ell : \ell \leq n \rangle$ , let  $d \in N_\eta$  realize  $p' \upharpoonright B_n$ .

Now if  $n > 0$ ,  $\text{tp}(d, B_n) \perp N_{\eta^-}$  hence  $\text{tp}(d, B_n) \perp B_{n-1}$ , hence  $\text{tp}(d, B_n) \perp \text{tp}_*(N_{\eta^-}, B_n)$ , hence as  $\text{tp}(d, B_n)$  is stationary by [Sh:c, V, 1.2(2), p.231], the types  $\text{tp}(d, B_n), \text{tp}_*(N_{\eta^-}, B_n)$  are weakly orthogonal so  $\text{tp}(d, B_n) \vdash \text{tp}(d, N_{\eta^-} \cup B_n)$  hence  $\frac{B_n + d}{B_{n+1} + a_\eta^1} \vdash \frac{B_n + d}{N_{\eta^-}^1 + a_\eta^1}$ .

Now replace  $B_n$  by  $B_n \cup \{d\}$  and we finish].

Note that necessarily

$$(\delta)^+ \quad B_n \bigcup_{B_m} N_{\eta \upharpoonright m}^1 \text{ for } m \leq n.$$

[Why? By the nonforking calculus].

$$(\epsilon)^+ \quad \frac{B_n}{B_m + a_{\eta \upharpoonright (m+1)}^1} \perp_a B_m \text{ for } m < n.$$

[Why? As  $N_{\eta \upharpoonright m}^1$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated].

Choose  $D^* \subseteq N_{<>}^2$  finite such that  $\frac{B_n}{N_{<>}^2 + B}$  does not fork over  $D^* + B$ .

[Note: we really mean  $D^* \subseteq N_{<>}^2$ , not  $D^* \subseteq N_{<>}^1$ ].

We can find  $N_{<>}^3$ ,  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\emptyset$  such that  $A \subseteq N_{<>}^3 \prec N_{<>}^2$  and  $D^* \bigcup_A N_{<>}^3$  and  $N_{<>}^2$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_{<>}^3 \cup D^*$  (by 1.14(9)). Hence  $B_n \bigcup_B N_{<>}^3$  (by non-forking calculus). As  $\text{tp}_*(B, N_{<0>}^2)$  does not fork over  $A \subseteq N_{<>}^3 \subseteq N_{<>}^2$  by 1.17(2) we can find  $N_\eta^3, a_\eta^3$  (for  $\eta \in I^2 \setminus \{<>\}$ ), such that  $\langle N_\eta^3, a_\eta^3 : \eta \in I^2 \rangle \leq_{\text{direct}}^* \langle N_\eta^2, a_\eta^2 : \eta \in I^2 \rangle$  and  $a_{<0>}^3 = a_{<0>}^2$  (remember  $\text{dcl}(a_{<0>}^2) = \text{dcl}(B)$ ). By 1.16(2) we know  $\langle N_\eta^3, a_\eta^3 : \eta \in I^2 \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  for  $\left(\frac{B}{A}\right)$ .

By 1.18 it is enough to show  $p \in \mathcal{P}(\langle N_\eta^3, a_\eta^3 : \eta \in I^2 \rangle, M)$ . Let  $N_{<>}^4 \prec N_{<>}^2 \prec M$  be  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_{<>}^3 \cup B_0$ . Now by the non-forking calculus  $B \bigcup_A (N_{<>}^3 \cup B_0)$  [why?

because

$$(a) \text{ as said above } B_n \bigcup_B N_{<>}^3 \text{ but } B_0 \subseteq B_n \text{ so } B_0 \bigcup_B N_{<>}^3, \text{ and}$$

(b) as  $B \amalg_A N_{<>}^1$  and  $B_0 \subseteq N_{<>}^1$  we have  $B \amalg_A B_0$  so  $B_0 \amalg_A B$

hence (by (a) + (b) as  $A \subseteq B$ )

(c)  $\frac{B_0}{N_{<>}^3 + B}$  does not fork over  $A$ , also

(d)  $B \amalg_A N_{<>}^3$  (as  $A \subseteq N_{<>}^3 \subseteq N_{<>}^2$  and  $\text{tp}(B, N_{<>}^3)$  does not fork over  $A$ )  
 putting (c) and (d) together we get

(e)  $\amalg_A \{B_0, B, N_{<>}^3\}$   
 hence the conclusion].

Hence  $B \amalg_{N_{<>}^3} B_0$  so  $B \amalg_{N_{<>}^3} N_{<>}^4$  (by 1.14(6)) and so (as  $A \subseteq N_{<>}^3 \subseteq N_{<>}^4$ ) we

have  $N_{<>}^4 \amalg_{N_{<>}^3} N_{<0>}^3$  and by 1.17(1) we can define  $N_\eta^4 \prec M$  (for  $\eta \in I^2 \setminus \{<>\}$ ),

such that  $\langle N_\eta^4, a_\eta^3 : \eta \in I^2 \rangle \geq_{\text{direct}} \langle N_\eta^3, a_\eta^3 : \eta \in I^2 \rangle$ . So by 1.16(1)

$\langle N_\eta^4, a_\eta^3 : \eta \in I^2 \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  for  $\binom{B}{A}$  and by 1.18 it is enough to prove  $p \in \mathcal{P}(\langle N_\eta^4, a_\eta^3 : \eta \in I^2 \rangle, M)$ . Now as said above  $B \amalg_{N_{<>}^3} N_{<>}^4$  and  $B \amalg_A N_{<>}^3$

so together  $B \amalg_A N_{<>}^4$ , also we have  $A \subseteq B_0 \subseteq N_{<>}^4$ , hence  $B \amalg_{B_0} N_{<>}^4$  and

$\frac{B_n}{B_0+B} = \frac{B_n}{B_0+a_{<0>}^3} \perp_a B_0$  (by  $(\epsilon)^+$  above) but  $a_{<>}^3 \amalg_{B_0} N_{<>}^4$  hence  $\frac{B_n}{N_{<>}^4+a_{<0>}^3}$  is

$\aleph_\epsilon$ -isolated. Also letting  $B'_n = B_n \setminus \{d\}$  we have  $\frac{d}{B'_n} \perp B_0$  (by clause  $(\zeta)$ ), and clearly  $d \amalg_{B_n} (N_{<>}^4 \cup B'_n)$  so  $\frac{d}{B'_n} \perp N_{<>}^4$ . Hence we can find  $\langle N_\eta^5, a_\eta^5 : \eta \in I^5 \rangle$  an

$\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  for  $\binom{B}{A}$  such that  $N_{<>}^5 = N_{<>}^4$ ,  $\text{dcl}(B) = \text{dcl}(a_{<0>}^5)$ ,  
 $B_n \setminus \{d\} \subseteq N_{<0>}^5$  and  $d = a_{<0,0>}^5$  (on  $d$  see clause  $(\zeta)$  above) so  $d \amalg_{B_n} N_{<0>}^5$ .

By 1.19 it is enough to show  $p \in \mathcal{P}(\langle N_\eta^5, a_\eta^5 : \eta \in I^5 \rangle, M)$  which holds trivially as  $\text{tp}(d, B_n \setminus \{d\})$  witness.  $\square_{1.10(6)}$

**1.20 Observation.** If  $\binom{B_1}{A_1} \leq^* \binom{B_2}{A_2}$  then we can find  $\langle B'_\ell : \ell \leq n \rangle$  and

$\langle c_\ell : 1 \leq \ell < n \rangle$  for some  $n \geq 1$ , satisfying  $\binom{B_1}{A_1} \leq_b \binom{B'_1}{B'_0}$ ,  $c_\ell \in B'_{\ell+1}$ ,  $\frac{c_\ell}{B'_\ell}$  regular,

$\frac{B'_{\ell+1}}{c_\ell+B'_\ell} \perp_a B'_\ell$ ,  $A_2 = B'_{n-1}$ ,  $B_2 = B'_n$ .

*Remark.* This means that in a sense  $\leq_b$  is enough,  $\leq_a$  inessential.

*Proof.* By the definition of  $\leq^*$  there are  $k < \omega$  and  $\binom{B_\ell}{A_\ell}$  for  $\ell \leq k$  such that:  
 $\binom{B_\ell}{A_\ell} \leq_{x(\ell)} \binom{B_{\ell+1}}{A_{\ell+1}}$  for  $\ell \leq k$  and  $x(\ell) \in \{a, b\}$  and  $\binom{B_0}{A_0} = \binom{B_1}{A_1}$ ,  $\binom{B_k}{A_k} = \binom{B_2}{A_2}$  and without loss of generality  $x(2\ell) = a, x(2\ell+1) = b$ . Let  $N_0 \prec \mathfrak{C}$  be  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\emptyset$  such that  $A^0 \subseteq N_0, B_0 \amalg A^0$  and  $f_0 = \text{id}_{A_0}$ . We choose by induction on

$\ell \leq k, N_{\ell+1}, f_{\ell+1}$  such that:

- (a)  $\text{Dom}(f_{\ell+1}) = B^\ell$
  - (b)  $N_\ell \prec N_{\ell+1}$
  - (c) if  $x(\ell) = b$  then  $f_{\ell+1}$  is an extension of  $f_\ell$  (which necessarily has domain  $A_\ell$ , check) with domain  $B^\ell$  such that  $f_\ell(B^\ell) \upharpoonright N_\ell$  and  $N_{\ell+1}$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $f_\ell(A^\ell)$
- over  $N_\ell \cup f_\ell(B^\ell)$
- (d) if  $x(\ell) = a$ , then  $f_{\ell+1}$  maps  $A^\ell$  into  $N_{\ell-1}$ ,  $B^\ell$  into  $N_\ell$  and  $N_{\ell+1} = N_\ell$ .

This is straightforward. Now on  $\langle N_\ell : \ell \leq k+1 \rangle$  we repeat the argument (of choosing  $\langle B_\ell : \ell \leq n \rangle$ ) in the proof of 1.10(6) above.  $\square_{1.20}$

*Proof of 1.10(5).* By 1.20, there are  $\langle B_\ell : \ell \leq n \rangle, \langle c_\ell : 1 \leq \ell < n \rangle$  as there. We can choose  $N_{<>}^1$  such that  $B_0 \subseteq N_{<>}^1, N_{<1>}^1 \upharpoonright B_0, N_{<>}^1$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $\emptyset$ . Then

we choose  $\left\langle N_\eta^1, a_\eta^1 : \eta \in \left\{ \langle >, < 0, >, < 0, 0, >, \dots, \underbrace{\langle 0, \dots, 0 \rangle}_n \right\} \right\rangle$ , (where  $N_{\underbrace{\langle 0, \dots, 0 \rangle}_n}^1 \prec M$  and  $\ell > 0 \Rightarrow a_{\underbrace{\langle 0, \dots, 0 \rangle}_\ell}^1 = c_\ell$  and we choose  $N_\eta^1$  by induction on  $\ell g(\eta)$  being  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_{\eta^-}^1 \cup a_\eta^1$  which is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  for  $\binom{B_1}{A_1}$ ). Now apply 1.10(6).  $\square_{1.10(5)}$

*Proof of 1.10(8).* Read Definition 1.6.

*Proof of 1.10(7).* Should be easy. Note that

- (\*)<sub>1</sub> for no  $\binom{B'}{A'}$  do we have  $\binom{B}{A} \leq_b \binom{B'}{A'}$   
Why? By the definition of Depth zero.
- (\*)<sub>2</sub> if  $\binom{B}{A} <_a \binom{B'}{A'}$ , then also  $\binom{B'}{A'}$  satisfies the assumption.

Hence

- (\*\*) for no  $\binom{B_1}{A_1}, \binom{B_2}{A_2}$  do we have

$$\binom{B}{A} \leq_a \binom{B_1}{A_1} <_b \binom{B_2}{A_2}.$$

[Why? As also  $\binom{B_1}{A_1}$  satisfies the assumption].

Now we can prove the statement by induction on  $\alpha$  for all pairs  $\binom{B}{A}$  satisfying the assumption. For  $\alpha = 0$  the statement is a tautology. For  $\alpha$  limit ordinal reread clause (c) of Definition 1.6(1). For  $\alpha = \beta + 1$ , reread clause (b) of Definition 1.6(1): on  $\text{tp}_\beta(\binom{B}{A}, M)$  use the induction hypothesis also for computing  $Y_{A,B,M}^{1,B}$  (and reread the definition of  $\text{tp}_0$ , in Definition 1.6(1), clause (a)). Lastly  $Y_{A,B,M}^{2,\beta}$  is empty by (\*) above.  $\square_{1.10(5),(7),(8)}$

*Discussion.* In particular, the following Claim 1.23 implies that if  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  over  $\binom{B}{A}$  and  $M^-$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\cup \{N_\eta : \eta \in I\}$  then  $\binom{B}{A}$  has the same  $\text{tp}_\alpha$  in  $M$  and  $M^-$ .

**1.21Claim.** 1) Assume that  $M_1 \prec M_2$  are  $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -saturated,  $\binom{B}{A} \in \Gamma(M_1)$ . Then the following are equivalent:

- (a) if  $p \in \mathcal{P}(\binom{B}{A}, M_1)$   
(see 1.10(6) for definition; so  $p \in S(M_1)$  is regular) then  $p$  is not realized in  $M_2$
- (b) there is an  $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -decomposition of  $M_2$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ , which is also an  $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -decomposition of  $M_2$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$
- (c) every  $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -decomposition of  $M_1$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$  is also an  $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -decomposition of  $M_2$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ .

2) If  $M$  is  $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -saturated,  $\binom{B_1}{A_1} \leq^* \binom{B_2}{A_2}$  are both in  $\Gamma(M)$  then  $\mathcal{P}(\binom{B_2}{A_2}, M) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\binom{B_1}{A_1}, M)$ .

3) The conditions in 1.21(1) above implies

- (d)  $p \in \mathcal{P}(\binom{B}{A}, M_2) \Rightarrow p \perp M_1$ .

*Proof.* 1) (c)  $\Rightarrow$  (b).

By 1.10(1) there is an  $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -decomposition of  $M_1$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ . By clause (c) it is also an  $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -decomposition of  $M_2$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ , just as needed for clause (c).

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a)

Let  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  be as said in clause (b). By 1.10(3)(b) we can find  $J_1, I \subseteq J_1$  and  $N_\eta, a_\eta$  (for  $\eta \in J_1 \setminus I$ ) such that  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in J_1 \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -decomposition of  $M_1$  and  $\nu \in J_1 \setminus I \Rightarrow \nu(0) > 0$ . Then we can find  $J_2, J_1 \subseteq J_2$  and  $N_\eta, a_\eta$  (for  $\eta \in J_2 \setminus J_1$ ) such that  $\langle N_\eta : \eta \in J_2 \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -decomposition of  $M_2$  (by 1.10(2)). By 1.10(3)(b),  $\nu \in J_2 \setminus I \Rightarrow \nu(0) > 0$ . So  $\eta \in I \setminus \{\langle \rangle\} \Rightarrow \text{Suc}_{J_2}(\eta) = \text{Suc}_I(\eta)$ , hence

- (\*)  $\eta \in I \setminus \{\langle \rangle\}, q \in S(N_\eta)$  regular orthogonal to  $N_{\eta^-}$  then the stationarization of  $q$  in  $S(M_1)$  is not realized in  $M_2$ .

Now if  $p \in \mathcal{P}(\binom{B}{A}, M_1)$  then  $p \in S(M_1)$  is regular and (see 1.10(1), 1.7(5)) for some  $\eta \in I \setminus \{\langle \rangle\}, p \perp N_{\eta^-}, p \perp N_\eta$ , so there is a regular  $q \in S(N_\eta)$  not orthogonal to  $p$ . Now no  $c \in M_2$  realizes the stationarization of  $q$  over  $M_1$  (by (\*) above), hence this applies to  $p$ , too.

(a)  $\Rightarrow$  (c)

Let  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  be an  $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -decomposition of  $M_1$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ . We can find  $\langle N_\eta^*, a_\eta^* : \eta \in J \rangle$  an  $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -decomposition of  $M_1$  such that  $I \subseteq J$  and  $\nu \in J \setminus I \Rightarrow \nu(0) > 0$  (by 1.10(3)(b)). We should check that it is also an  $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -decomposition of  $M_2$  above  $\binom{B}{A}$ , i.e. Definition 1.7(1),(2). Now in 1.7(1), clauses (a)-(h) are immediate, so let us check clause (i) (in 1.7(2)). Let  $\eta \in I \setminus \{\langle \rangle\}$ , now is  $\{a_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle \alpha \rangle} : \eta \hat{\ } \langle \alpha \rangle \in I\}$  really maximal (among independent over  $N_\eta$  sets of elements of  $M_2$  realizing a type from  $\mathcal{P}_\eta = \{p \in S(N_\eta) : p \text{ regular orthogonal to } N_{\eta^-}\}$ . This should be clear from Claim (a) (and basic properties of dependencies for regular types).

2) By 1.10(5).

3) Left to the reader.

□<sub>1.21</sub>

1.22 Conclusion: Assume  $M_1 \prec M_2$  are  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated and  $\binom{B_1}{A_1} \leq^* \binom{B_2}{A_2}$  both in  $\Gamma(M_1)$ . If clause (a) (equivalently (b) or (c)) of 1.21 holds for  $\binom{B_1}{A_1}, M_1, M_2$  then they hold for  $\binom{B_2}{A_2}, M_1, M_2$ .

*Proof.* By 1.21(1), clause (a) for  $\binom{B_1}{A_1}, M_1, M_2$  implies clause (a) for  $\binom{B_2}{A_2}, M_1, M_2$ .  $\square_{1.22}$

**1.23 Claim.** If  $\binom{B_1}{A_1} \in \Gamma(M)$  and  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  is an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  above  $\binom{B_1}{A_1}$  and  $M^- \subseteq M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated and  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta \subseteq M^-$  then

$$\text{tp}_\alpha \left[ \binom{B_1}{A_1}, M \right] = \text{tp}_\alpha \left[ \binom{B_1}{A_1}, M^- \right]$$

*Proof.* We prove by induction on  $\alpha$  (for all  $B, A, \langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle, I, M$  and  $M^-$  as above). We can find an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in J \rangle$  of  $M$  with  $I \subseteq J$  (by 1.9(4) + 1.9(2)) such that  $\eta \in J \setminus I \Leftrightarrow \eta \neq \langle \rangle$  &  $\neg \langle 0 \rangle \trianglelefteq \eta$  and  $M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\bigcup_{\eta \in J} N_\eta$ .

Case 0:  $\alpha = 0$ .

Trivial.

Case 1:  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal.

Trivial by induction hypothesis (and the definition of  $\text{tp}_\alpha$ ).

Case 2:  $\alpha = \beta + 1$ .

We can find  $M^* \prec M^-$  which is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta$ , so as equality is transitive

it is enough to prove

$$\text{tp}_\alpha \left( \binom{B_1}{A_1}, M^* \right) = \text{tp} \left( \binom{B_1}{A_1}, M^- \right)$$

and

$$\text{tp} \left( \binom{B_1}{A_1}, M^* \right) = \text{tp} \left( \binom{B_1}{A_1}, M \right).$$

Reflecting, this means that it is enough to prove the statement when  $M^-$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta$ .

Looking at the definition of  $\text{tp}_{\beta+1}$  and remembering the induction hypothesis our problems are as follows:

First component of  $\text{tp}_\alpha$ :

given  $\binom{B_1}{A_1} \leq_a \binom{B_2}{A_2}$ ,  $B_2 \subseteq M$ , and it suffices to find  $\binom{B_3}{A_3}$  such that:

- (\*) there is  $f \in \text{AUT}(\mathfrak{C})$  such that:  $f \upharpoonright B_1 = \text{id}_{B_1}$ ,  $f(A_2) = A_3$ ,  
 $f(B_2) = B_3$  and  $B_3 \subseteq M^-$  and  $\text{tp}_\beta\left(\begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \\ A_2 \end{smallmatrix}, M\right) = \text{tp}_\beta\left(\begin{smallmatrix} B_3 \\ A_3 \end{smallmatrix}, M^-\right)$   
 (pedantically we should replace  $B_\ell, A_\ell$  by indexed sets).

We can find  $J', M'$  such that:

- (i)  $I \subseteq J' \subseteq J$ ,  $|J' \setminus I| < \aleph_0$ ,  $J'$  closed under initial segments,
- (ii)  $M' \prec M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $M^- \cup \bigcup \{N_\eta : \eta \in J' \setminus I\}$
- (iii)  $B_2 \subseteq M'$ .

The induction hypothesis for  $\beta$  applies, and gives

$$\text{tp}_\beta\left[\begin{pmatrix} B_2 \\ A_2 \end{pmatrix}, M\right] = \text{tp}_\beta\left[\begin{pmatrix} B_2 \\ A_2 \end{pmatrix}, M'\right].$$

By 1.10(4) there is  $g$ , an isomorphism from  $M'$  onto  $M^-$  such that  $g \upharpoonright B_1 = \text{id}$ .  
 So clearly  $g(B_2) \subseteq M^-$  hence

$$\text{tp}_\beta\left[\begin{pmatrix} B_2 \\ A_2 \end{pmatrix}, M'\right] = \text{tp}_\beta\left[\begin{pmatrix} g(B_2) \\ g(A_2) \end{pmatrix}, M^-\right].$$

So  $\begin{pmatrix} B_3 \\ A_3 \end{pmatrix} =: g\left(\begin{pmatrix} B_2 \\ A_2 \end{pmatrix}\right)$  is as required.

Second component for  $\text{tp}_\alpha$ :

So we are given  $\Upsilon$ , a  $\text{tp}_\beta$  type, (and we assign the lower part as  $B$ ) and we have to prove that the dimension in  $M$  and in  $M^-$  are the same, i.e.

$\text{Dim}(\mathbf{I}, M) = \text{dim}(\mathbf{I}^-, M)$ , where:  $\mathbf{I} = \{c \in M : \Upsilon = \text{tp}_\beta\left(\begin{pmatrix} c \\ B_1 \end{pmatrix}, M\right)\}$  and  
 $\mathbf{I}^- = \{c \in M^- : \Upsilon = \text{tp}_\beta\left(\begin{pmatrix} c \\ B_1 \end{pmatrix}, M^-\right)\}$ .

Let  $p$  be such that:  $\text{tp}_\beta\left(\begin{pmatrix} c \\ B_1 \end{pmatrix}, M\right) = \Upsilon \Rightarrow p = \frac{c}{B_1}$ . Necessarily  $p \perp A_1$  and  $p$  is regular (and stationary).

Clearly  $\mathbf{I}^- \subseteq \mathbf{I}$ , now

- (\*) for every  $c \in \mathbf{I}$  for some  $k < \omega$ ,  $c'_\ell \in M^-$  realizing  $p$  for  $\ell < k$  we have  $c$  depends on  $\{c'_0, c'_1, \dots, c'_{k-1}\}$  over  $B_1$ .

[Why? Clearly  $p \perp N_{<} >$  (as  $B_1 \bigcup_{A_1} N_{<} >$  and  $p \perp A_1$ ) hence

$$\text{tp}_*(\bigcup_{\eta \in J \setminus I} N_\eta, N_{<} >) \perp p \text{ hence}$$

$$\text{tp}_*(\bigcup_{\eta \in J \setminus I} N_\eta, M^-) \perp p, \text{ but } M \text{ is } \aleph_\epsilon\text{-prime over } M^- \cup \bigcup_{\eta \in J \setminus I} N_\eta \text{ hence}$$

by [Sh:c, V, 3.2, p.250] for no  $c \in M \setminus M^-$  is  $\text{tp}(c, M^-)$  a stationarization of  $p$  hence by [Sh:c, V, 1.16(3)] clearly (\*) follows].

If the type  $p$  has depth zero, then by (1.10(7))

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{I} &= \{c \in M : \text{tp}(c, B) = p\} \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{I}^- &= \{c \in M^- : \text{tp}(c, B) = p\}. \end{aligned}$$



Now we have to prove  $\dim(\mathbf{I}, A) = \dim(\mathbf{I}^-, A)$ , as  $A$  is  $\varepsilon$ -finite and  $M, M^-$  are  $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -saturated and  $\mathbf{I}^- \subseteq \mathbf{I}$  clearly  $\aleph_0 \leq \dim(\mathbf{I}^-, A) \leq \dim(\mathbf{I}, A)$ . Now the equality follows by (\*) above.

So we can assume “ $p$  has depth zero”, hence (by [Sh:c, X,7.2]) that the type  $p$  is trivial; hence, see [Sh:c, X7.3] in (\*) without loss of generality  $k = 1$  and dependency is an equivalence relation, so for “same dimension” it suffices to prove that every equivalence class (in  $M$  i.e. in  $\mathbf{I}$ ) is representable in  $M^-$  i.e. in  $\mathbf{I}^-$ . By the remark on (\*) in the previous sentence  $(\forall d_1 \in \mathbf{I})(\exists d_2 \in \mathbf{I}^-)[\neg d_1 \amalg_{B_1} d_2]$ . So it

is enough to prove that:

- ⊗ if  $d_1, d_2 \in M$  realize same type over  $B_1$ , which is (stationary and) regular, and are dependent over  $B_1$  and  $d_1 \in M^-$  then there is  $d'_2 \in M^-$  such that  $\frac{d'_2}{B_1+d_1} = \frac{d_2}{B_1+d_1}$  and  $\text{tp}_\beta[(\frac{B_1+d_2}{B_1}), M] = \text{tp}_\beta[(\frac{B_1+d'_2}{B_1}), M^-]$ .

Let  $M_0 = N_{\langle \rangle}$ . There are  $J', M_1, M_1^+$  such that

- (\*)<sub>1</sub>(i)  $J' \subseteq J$  is finite closed under initial segments
- (ii)  $\langle \rangle \in J', \langle 0 \rangle \notin J'$
- (iii)  $M_1 \prec M$  is  $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -prime over  $\cup\{N_\eta : \eta \in J'\}$
- (iv)  $M_1^+ \prec M$  is  $\aleph_\varepsilon$ -prime over  $M_1 \cup M^-$  (and  $M_1 \amalg_{M_0} M^-$ )
- (v)  $d_2 \in M_1^+$ .

Now the triple  $(\frac{B_1+d_2}{B_1}, M_1, M)$  satisfies the demand on  $(\frac{B_1}{A_1}, M^-, M)$  (because  $(\frac{B_1}{A_1}) \leq^* (\frac{B_1+d_2}{B_1})$ , by 1.22. Hence by the induction hypothesis we know that

$$\text{tp}[(\frac{B_1+d_2}{B_1}), M] = \text{tp}_\beta[(\frac{B_1+d_2}{B_1}), M_1^+].$$

By 1.26(4) there is an isomorphism  $f$  from  $M_1^+$  onto  $M^-$  which is the identity on  $B_1 + d_1$ ; let  $d'_2 = f(d_2)$  so:

$$\text{tp}_\beta[(\frac{B_1+d_2}{B_1}), M_1^+] = \text{tp}_\beta[(\frac{B_1+d'_2}{B_1}), M^-].$$

Together

$$\text{tp}_\beta[(\frac{B_1+d_2}{B_1}), M] = \text{tp}_\beta[(\frac{B_1+d'_2}{B_1}), M^-].$$

As  $\{d_1, d_2\}$  is not independent over  $B_1$ , also  $\{d_1, f(d_2)\}$  is not independent over  $B_1$ , hence, as  $p$  is regular

- (\*)  $\{d_2, f(d_2)\}$  is not independent over  $B_2$ .

Together we have proved  $\oplus$ , hence finished proving the equality of the second component.

Third component: Trivial.

So we have finished the induction step, hence the proof.  $\square_{1.23}$

**1.24 Claim.** 1) Suppose  $M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated,  $B \subseteq M$ ,  $(\frac{B}{A}) \in \Gamma$ ,  $\bigwedge_{\ell=1}^2 [A \subseteq A_\ell \subseteq M]$ ,

$A = \text{acl}(A)$ ,  $A_\ell$  are  $\epsilon$ -finite,  $\frac{A_1}{A} = \frac{A_2}{A}$ ,  $B \amalg_A A_1$  and  $B \amalg_A A_2$ .

Then  $\text{tp}_\alpha[(\frac{A_1 \cup B}{A_1}), M] = \text{tp}_\alpha[(\frac{A_2 \cup B}{A_2}), M]$  for any ordinal  $\alpha$ .

2) Suppose  $M$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated,  $B \subseteq M$ ,  $(\frac{B}{A}) \in \Gamma$ ,  $\bigwedge_{\ell=1}^2 [A \subseteq A_\ell \subseteq M]$ ,  $A = \text{acl}(A)$ ,

$B = \text{acl}(B)$ ,  $A_\ell = \text{acl}(A_\ell)$ ,  $A_\ell$  is  $\epsilon$ -finite,  $\frac{A_1}{A} = \frac{A_2}{A}$ ,  $B \amalg_A A_1$ ,  $B \amalg_A A_2$ ,  $f : A_1 \xrightarrow{\text{onto}} A_2$

an elementary mapping,  $f \upharpoonright A = \text{id}$ ,  $g \supseteq f \cup \text{id}_B$ ,  $g$  elementary mapping from  $B_1 = \text{acl}(B \cup A_1)$  onto  $B_2 = \text{acl}(B \cup A_2)$ .

Then  $g \left( \text{tp}_\alpha[(\frac{B_1}{A_1}), M] \right) = \text{tp}_\alpha[(\frac{B_2}{A_2}), M]$  for any ordinal  $\alpha$ .

*Proof.* 1) Follows from part (2).

2) We can find  $A_3 \subseteq M$  such that:

- (i)  $\frac{A_3}{A} = \frac{A_1}{A}$
- (ii)  $A_3 \amalg_A (B \cup A_1 \cup A_2)$ .

Hence without loss of generality  $A_1 \amalg_B A_2$  and even  $\amalg_B \{B, A_1, A_2\}$ . Now we can find  $N_{<>}$ , an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime model over  $\emptyset$ ,  $N_{<>} \prec M$ ,  $A \subseteq N_{<>}$  and  $(B \cup A_1 \cup A_2) \amalg_A N_{<>}$  (e.g. choose  $\{A_1^\alpha \cup A_2^\alpha \cup B^\alpha : \alpha \leq \omega\} \subseteq M$  indiscernible over  $A$ ,  $A_1^\omega = A_1$ ,  $A_2^\omega = A_2$ ,  $B^\omega = B$  and let  $N_{<>} \prec M$  be  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} (A_1^n \cup A_2^n \cup B^n \cup A)$ ).

Now find  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in J \rangle$  an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  with  $\text{dcl}(a_{<0>}) = \text{dcl}(B)$ ,  $\text{dcl}(a_{<1>}) = \text{dcl}(A_1)$ ,  $\text{dcl}(a_{<2>}) = \text{dcl}(A_2)$ .

Let  $I = \{\eta \in J : \eta = <> \text{ or } <0> \sqsubseteq \eta\}$  and  $J' = I \cup \{<1>, <2>\}$ . Let  $N_{<>}^2 \prec M^*$  be  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $N_{<1>} \cup N_{<2>}$ . By 1.17 there is  $\langle N_\eta^2, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$  an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -decomposition of  $M$  over  $(\frac{B}{A})$  such that  $\langle N_\eta, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle \leq_{\text{direct}} \langle N_\eta^2, a_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$ . Let  $M' \prec M$  be  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta^2$  and  $M^- \prec M'$  be  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta$ . So

$M^- \prec M' \prec M$  and  $M'$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $M^- \cup N_{<1>} \cup N_{<2>}$ .

Now by 1.23 we have  $\text{tp}_\alpha[(\frac{B}{A_\ell}), M] = \text{tp}_\alpha[(\frac{B}{A_\ell}), M']$  for  $\ell = 1, 2$  hence it suffices to find an automorphism of  $M'$  extending  $g$ . Let  $B^+ = \text{acl}(N_{<>} \cup B)$ ,  $A_\ell^* = \text{acl}(B \cup A_\ell)$ , let  $\bar{a}_\ell$  list  $A_\ell^*$  be such that  $\bar{a}_2 = g(\bar{a}_1)$ . Clearly  $\text{tp}(\bar{a}_\ell, B^+)$  does not fork over  $B$  and  $\text{acl}(B) = B$  and so  $\text{stp}(\bar{a}_1, B^+) = \text{stp}(\bar{a}_2, B^+)$ . Also  $\text{tp}_*(A_2, B^+ \cup A_1)$  does not fork over  $A$  hence  $\text{tp}(\bar{a}_2, B^+ \cup \bar{a}_1)$  does not fork over  $A \subseteq B^+$  hence  $\{\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2\}$  is independent over  $B^+$  hence there is an elementary mapping  $g^+$  from  $\text{acl}(B^+ \cup \bar{a}_1)$  onto  $\text{acl}(B^+ \cup \bar{a}_2)$ ,  $g^+ \supseteq \text{id}_{B^+} \cup g$  and even  $g' = g^+ \cup (g^+)^{-1}$  is an elementary embedding.

Let  $\bar{a}'_1$  list  $\text{acl}(N_{<>} \cup A_1)$  so clearly  $\bar{a}'_2 =: g^+(\bar{a}'_1)$  list  $\text{acl}(N_{<>} \cup A_2)$ . Clearly  $g' \upharpoonright (\bar{a}'_1 \cup \bar{a}'_2)$  is an elementary mapping from  $\bar{a}'_1 \cup \bar{a}'_2$  onto itself. Now  $N_{<>}^2$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $N_{<>} \cup A_1 \cup A_2$  and  $N_{<>} \cup A_1 \cup A_2 \subseteq \bar{a}'_1 \cup \bar{a}'_2 \subseteq \text{acl}(N_{<>} \cup A_1 \cup A_2)$  so easily  $N_{<>}^2$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $\bar{a}'_1 \cup \bar{a}'_2$  hence we can extend  $g' \upharpoonright (\bar{a}'_1 \cup \bar{a}'_2)$  to

an automorphism  $h_{<>}$  of  $N_{<>}^2$  so clearly  $h_{<>} \upharpoonright N_{<>} = \text{id}_{N_{<>}}$ . Let  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1^+$  list  $\text{acl}(B^+ \cup A_1)$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_2^+ = g^+(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1^+)$ . So  $\text{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1^+, N_{<>}^2)$  does not fork over  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1' (\subseteq N_{<>}^2)$  and  $\text{acl}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1') = \text{Rang}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1') (= \text{acl}(N_{<>} \cup A_1))$  and  $h_{<>} \upharpoonright \bar{\mathbf{a}}_1' = g^+ \upharpoonright \bar{\mathbf{a}}_1'$  hence  $h_{<>} \cup g^+$  is an elementary embedding. Remember  $g^+$  is the identity on  $B^+ = \text{acl}(N_{<>} \cup B)$ , and  $\text{tp}_*(N_{<0>}, N_{<>}^2)$  does not fork over  $N_{<>}$  hence  $\text{tp}_*(N_{<0>}, B^+ \cup N_{<>}^2)$  does not fork over  $B^+$ , so as  $\text{acl}(B^+) = B^+$  necessarily  $(h_{<>} \cup g^+) \cup \text{id}_{N_{<0>}}$  is an elementary embedding. But this mapping has domain and range including  $N_{<0>} \cup N_{<>}^2$  and included in  $N_{<0>}^2$ , but the latter is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary and  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -minimal over the former. Hence  $(h_{<>} \cup g^+) \cup \text{id}_{N_{<>}}$  can be extended to an automorphism of  $N_{<0>}^2$  which we call  $h_{<0>}$ .

Now we define by induction on  $n \in [2, \omega)$  for every  $\eta \in I$  of length  $n$ , an automorphism  $h_\eta$  of  $N_\eta^2$  extending  $h_{\eta^-} \cup \text{id}_{N_\eta^-}$ , which exists as  $N_\eta^2$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -primary over  $N_{\eta^-}^2 \cup N_\eta$  (and  $N_{\eta^-}^2 \bigcup_{N_{\eta^-}} N_\eta$ ). Now  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} h_\eta$  is an elementary mapping (as  $\langle N_\eta^2 : \eta \in I \rangle$

is a non-forking tree; i.e. 1.9(10)), with domain and range  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I} N_\eta^2$  hence can be extended to an automorphism  $h^*$  of  $M'$ , (we can demand  $h^* \upharpoonright M^- = \text{id}_{M^-}$  but not necessarily). So as  $h^*$  extends  $g$ , the conclusion follows.  $\square_{1.24}$

**1.25 Claim.** 1) For every  $\Upsilon = \text{tp}_\delta[\binom{B}{A}, M]$ , and  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}$  listing  $A, B$  respectively there is  $\psi = \psi(\bar{x}_A, \bar{x}_B) \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}(q.d.)$  of depth  $\delta$  such that:

$$\text{tp}_\delta[\binom{B}{A}, M] = \Upsilon \Leftrightarrow M \models \psi[\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}].$$

2) Assume  $\bigotimes_{M_1, M_2}$  of 1.3 holds as exemplified by  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\binom{B}{A} \in \Gamma(M_1)$  and  $g \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $\text{Dom}(g) = B$ ; and  $\alpha$  an ordinal then

$$\text{tp}_\alpha\left(\binom{B}{A}, M\right) = \text{tp}_\alpha\left(\binom{g(B)}{g(A)}, M_2\right).$$

3) Similarly for  $\text{tp}_\alpha([A], M)$ ,  $\text{tp}_\alpha[M]$ .

*Proof.* Straightforward (remember we assume every first order formula is equivalent to a predicate).  $\square_{1.25}$

**1.26 Proof of Theorem 1.2.** [The proof does not require that the  $M^\ell$  are  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated, but only that 1.24, 1.25 hold except in constructing  $g_{\alpha(*)}$  (see  $\otimes_{14}, \otimes_{15}$  in 1.27(E), we could instead use NOTOP].

So suppose

$$(*)_0 \quad M^1 \equiv_{\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}(d.q.)} M^2 \text{ or (at least) } \bigotimes_{M^1, M^2} \text{ from 1.3 holds.}$$

We shall prove  $M^1 \cong M^2$ . By 1.25 (i.e. by 1.25(1) if the first possibility in  $(*)_0$  holds and by 1.25(2) if the second possibility in  $(*)_0$  holds)

$$(*)_1 \quad \text{tp}_\infty[M^1] = \text{tp}_\infty[M^2].$$

So it suffices to prove:

**1.27 Claim.** If  $M^1, M^2$  are  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated models (of  $T, T$  as in 1.4), then:

$$(*)_1 \Rightarrow M^1 \cong M^2.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\langle W_k, W'_k : k < \omega \rangle$  be a partition of  $\omega$  to infinite sets (so pairwise disjoint).

**1.28 Explanation:** (If seems opaque, the reader may return to it after reading part of the proof).

We shall now define an approximation to a decomposition. We are approximating a non-forking trees  $\langle N_\eta^\ell, a_\eta^\ell : \eta \in I^* \rangle$  of countable elementary submodels of  $M^\ell$  and  $\langle f_\eta^* : \eta \in I^* \rangle$  such that  $f_\eta^*$  an isomorphism from  $N_\eta^1$  onto  $N_\eta^2$  increasing with  $\eta$  such that  $M^\ell$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -prime over  $\bigcup_{\eta \in I^*} N_\eta^\ell$ .

- ( $\alpha$ ) In the approximation we have:  $I$  approximating  $I^*$ ,  
[it will not be  $I^* \cap {}^{n \geq \text{ordinal}}$  and we may “discover” more immediate successor to each  $\eta \in I$ ; as the approximation to  $N_\eta$  improves we have more regular types, but some member of  $I$  will be later will drop]
- ( $\beta$ )  $A_\eta^\ell$  approximates  $N_\eta^\ell$  and is  $\epsilon$ -finite
- ( $\gamma$ )  $a_\eta^\ell$  is the  $a_\eta^\ell$  (if  $\eta$  survives, i.e. will not be dropped)
- ( $\delta$ )  $B_\eta^\ell, b_{\eta,m}^\ell$  expresses commitments on constructing  $A_\eta^\ell$ : we “promise”  
 $B_\eta^\ell \subseteq N_\eta^\ell$  and  $B_\eta^\ell$  is countable;  $b_{\eta,m}^\ell$  for  $m < \omega$  list  $B_\eta^\ell$  (so in the choice  $B_\eta^\ell \subseteq M^\ell$  there is some arbitrariness)
- ( $\epsilon$ )  $f_\eta$  approximate  $f_\eta^*$
- ( $\zeta$ )  $p_{\eta,m}^\ell$  also expresses commitments on the construction.

Since there are infinitely many commitments that we must meet in a construction of length  $\omega$  and we want many chances to meet each of them, the sets  $W_k, W'_k$  are introduced as a further bookkeeping device. At stage  $n$  in the construction we will deal e.g. with the  $b_{\eta,m}^\ell$  for  $\eta$  that are appropriate and for  $m \in W_k$  for some  $k < n$  and analogously for  $p_{\eta,m}^\ell$  and the  $W'_k$ .

Note that while the  $A_\eta^\ell$  satisfy the independence properties of a decomposition, the  $B_\eta^\ell$  do not and may well intersect non-trivially. Nevertheless, a conflict arises if an  $a_{\eta^\wedge < i >}^\ell$  falls into  $B_\eta^\ell$  since the  $a_{\eta^\wedge < i >}^\ell$  are supposed to represent independent elements realizing regular types over the model approximated by  $A_\eta^\ell$  but now  $a_{\eta^\wedge < i >}^\ell$  is in that model. This problem is addressed by pruning  $\eta^\wedge < i >$  from the tree  $I$ .

**1.29 Definition.** An approximation  $Y$  to an isomorphism consist of:

- (a) natural numbers  $n, k^*$  and index set:  $I \subseteq {}^{n \geq}$  ordinals  
(and  $n$  minimal)
- (b)  $\langle A_\eta^\ell, B_\eta^\ell, a_\eta^\ell, b_{\eta,m}^\ell : \eta \in I \text{ and } m \in \bigcup_{k < k^*} W_k \rangle$  for  $\ell = 1, 2$  (this is an approximated decomposition)
- (c)  $\langle f_\eta : \eta \in I \rangle$
- (d)  $\langle p_{\eta,m}^\ell : \eta \in I \text{ and } m \in \bigcup_{k < k^*} W'_k \rangle$

such that:

- (1)  $I$  closed under initial segments
- (2)  $\langle \rangle \in I$
- (3)  $A_\eta^\ell \subseteq B_\eta^\ell \subseteq M^\ell$ ,  $A_\eta^\ell$  is  $\epsilon$ -finite,  $\text{acl}(A_\eta^\ell) = A_\eta^\ell$ ,  $B_\eta^\ell$  is countable,  
 $B_\eta^\ell = \{b_{\eta,m}^\ell : m \in \bigcup_{k < k^*} W_k\}$
- (4)  $A_\nu^\ell \subseteq A_\eta^\ell$  if  $\nu \triangleleft \eta \in I$
- (5) if  $\eta \in I \setminus \{\langle \rangle\}$ , then  $\frac{a_\eta^\ell}{A_{(\eta^-)}^\ell}$  is a (stationary) regular type and  $a_\eta^\ell \in A_\eta^\ell$ ; if in addition  $\ell g(\eta) > 1$  then  $\frac{a_\eta^\ell}{A_{(\eta^-)}^\ell} \perp A_{(\eta^{--})}^\ell$  (note  $a_{\langle \rangle}^\ell$  may be not defined or  $\in A_{\langle \rangle}^\ell$ )
- (6)  $\frac{A_\eta^\ell}{A_{\eta^-}^\ell + a_\eta^\ell} \perp_a A_{\eta^-}^\ell$  if  $\eta \in I$ ,  $\ell g(\eta) > 0$
- (7) for  $\eta \in I$ , not  $\triangleleft$ -maximal in  $I$  the set  $\{a_\nu^\ell : \nu \in I \text{ and } \nu^- = \eta\}$  is a maximal family of elements realizing over  $A_\eta^\ell$  regular types  $\perp A_{(\eta^-)}^\ell$  (when  $\eta^-$  is defined), independent over  $(A_\eta^\ell, B_\eta^\ell)$ , (and we can add: if  $\nu_1^- = \nu_2^- = \eta$  and  $\frac{a_{\nu_1}^\ell}{A_\eta^\ell} \pm \frac{a_{\nu_2}^\ell}{A_\eta^\ell}$  then  $a_{\nu_1}^\ell / A_\eta^\ell = a_{\nu_2}^\ell / A_\eta^\ell$ )
- (8)  $f_\eta$  an elementary map from  $A_\eta^1$  onto  $A_\eta^2$
- (9)  $f_{(\eta^-)} \subseteq f_\eta$  when  $\eta \in I$ ,  $\ell g(\eta) > 0$
- (10)  $f_\eta(a_\eta^1) = a_\eta^2$
- (11) (α)  $f_\eta \left( \text{tp}_\infty \left[ \left( \frac{A_\eta^1}{A_{(\eta^-)}^1}, M^1 \right) \right] \right) = \text{tp}_\infty \left[ \left( \frac{A_\eta^2}{A_{(\eta^-)}^2}, M^2 \right) \right]$  when  $\eta \in I \setminus \{\langle \rangle\}$   
 (β)  $f_{\langle \rangle} \left( \text{tp}_\infty [A_{\langle \rangle}^1, M^1] \right) = \text{tp}_\infty [A_{\langle \rangle}^2, M^2]$
- (12)  $B_\eta^\ell \prec M^\ell$
- (13)  $\langle p_{\eta,m}^\ell : m \in \bigcup_{k < k^*} W'_k \rangle$  is a sequence of types over  $A_\eta^\ell$ .

*1.30 Notation.* We write  $n = n_Y = n[Y]$ ,  $I = I_Y = I[Y]$ ,  $A_\eta^\ell = A_\eta^\ell[Y]$ ,  $B_\eta^\ell = B_\eta^\ell[Y]$ ,  $f_\eta = f_\eta^Y = f_\eta[Y]$ ,  $a_\eta^\ell = a_\eta^\ell[Y]$ ,  $b_\eta^\ell = b_\eta^\ell[Y]$ ,  $k^* = k_Y^* = k^*[Y]$  and  $p_{\eta,m}^\ell = p_{\eta,k}^\ell[Y]$ .

*Remark.* We may want to demand: each  $\frac{a_{\eta^- \leq i}^\ell}{A_\eta^\ell}$  is strongly regular; also: if two such types are not orthogonal then they are equal (or at least have same witness  $\varphi$  for  $\left( \varphi, \frac{a_{\eta^- \leq i}^\ell}{A_\eta^\ell} \right)$  regular). Why can we? As the models are  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated (so take  $p' \pm p$ ,  $rk(p')$  minimal).

*1.31 Observation.*  $(*)_1$  implies that there is an approximation.

*Proof.* Let  $I = \{\langle \rangle\}$ ,  $A_{\langle \rangle}^\ell = \text{acl}(\emptyset)$ ,  $k^* = 1$  and then choose countable  $B_{\langle \rangle}^\ell$  to satisfy condition (12) and then choose  $f_\eta, p_k^\ell, b_{\eta,m}^\ell (k \in W_0)(m \in W_0)$  as required.

1.32 *Main Fact.* For any approximation  $Y, i \in \bigcup_{k < k_Y^*} (W_k \cup W'_k)$  and  $m \leq n_Y$  and

$\ell(*) \in \{1, 2\}$  we can find an approximation  $Z$  such that:

- ( $\otimes$ )( $\alpha$ )  $n_Z = \text{Max}\{m+1, n_Y\}, I_Z \cap {}^{m \geq \text{ord}} = I_Y \cap {}^{m \geq \text{ord}},$   
 (we mean  $m$  not  $n_Y$ ) and  $k_Z^* = k_Y^* + 1$   
 ( $\beta$ ) (a) if  $\eta \in I_Y, \ell g(\eta) < m$  then

$$A_\eta^\ell[Z] = A_\eta^\ell[Y],$$

$$a_\eta^\ell[Z] = a_\eta^\ell[Y]$$

$$B_\eta^\ell[Z] = B_\eta^\ell[Y]$$

- (b) if  $\eta \in I_Y \cap I_Z, k < k_Y^*$  and  $j \in W'_k$  then  
 $p_{\eta,j}^\ell[Z] = p_{\eta,j}^\ell[Y]$   
 (c) if  $\eta \in I_Y \cap I_Z, k < k_Y^*$  and  $j \in W_k$  then  
 $b_{\eta,j}^\ell[Z] = b_{\eta,j}^\ell[Y]$

( $\gamma$ )<sup>1</sup> if  $\eta \in I_Y, \ell g(\eta) = m, k < k_Y^*$  and  $i \in W_k$  and the element  $b \in M^{\ell(*)}$  satisfies clauses (a), (b) below then for some such  $b : A_\eta^{\ell(*)}[Z] = \text{acl}(A_\eta^{\ell(*)}[Y] \cup \{b\})$ ; where

- (a)  $b_{\eta,i}^{\ell(*)}[Y] \notin A_\eta^{\ell(*)}[Y]$  and  $\frac{b}{A_\eta^{\ell(*)}[Y]} \perp_a A_{\eta^-}^{\ell(*)}[Y]$   
 (b) one of the conditions (i),(ii) listed below holds for  $b$   
 (i)  $b = b_{\eta,i}^{\ell(*)}[Y]$  and  
 $\ell g(\eta) > 0 \Rightarrow \frac{b}{A_\eta^{\ell(*)}[Y]} \perp_a A_{\eta^-}^{\ell(*)}[Y]$  or  
 (ii) for no  $b$  is (i) satisfied (so  $\ell g(\eta) > 0$ ) and  $b \in M^{\ell(*)}$ ,  
 $\frac{b}{A_\eta^{\ell(*)}[Y]} \perp_a A_{\eta^-}^{\ell(*)}[Y]$  and  $b_{\eta,i}^\ell \bigoplus_{A_\eta^{\ell(*)}[Y]} b$  or

( $\gamma$ )<sup>2</sup> assume  $\eta \in I_Y, \ell g(\eta) = m, k < k_Y^*$  and  $i \in W'_k$  then we have:

- (a) if  $p_{\eta,i}^{\ell(*)}$  is realized by some  $b \in M^{\ell(*)}$  such that

$$R\left(\frac{b}{A_\eta^{\ell(*)}[Y]}, L, \infty\right) = R\left(p_{\eta,i}^{\ell(*)}, L, \infty\right) \text{ and}$$

$$\left[\ell g(\eta) > 0 \Rightarrow \frac{b}{A_\eta^{\ell(*)}[Y]} \perp_a A_{\eta^-}^{\ell(*)}[Y]\right]$$

then for some such  $b$  we have

$$A_\eta^{\ell(*)}[Z] = \text{acl}\left(A_\eta^{\ell(*)}[Y] \cup \{b\}\right)$$

- (b) if the assumption of clause (a) fails and  $p_{\eta,i}^{\ell(*)}$  is realized

by some  $b \in M^{\ell(*)} \setminus A_{\eta}^{\ell(*)}$  such that

$$\left[ \ell g(\eta) > 0 \Rightarrow \frac{b}{A_{\eta}^{\ell(*)}[Y]} \perp_a A_{\eta}^{\ell(*)}[Y] \right]$$

then for some such  $b$  we have

$$A_{\eta}^{\ell(*)}[Z] = \text{acl} \left[ A_{\eta}^{\ell(*)}[Y] \cup \{b\} \right]$$

- ( $\delta$ ) If  $\eta \in I_Y$  and  $\ell g(\eta) = m$ , then  $B_{\eta}^{\ell}[Z] = \{b_{\eta,j}^{\ell}[Y] : j \in \cup\{W_k : k < k_Z^*\}\}$  is a countable subset of  $M^{\ell}$ , containing  $\{B_{\nu}^{\ell}[Z] : \nu \trianglelefteq \eta \text{ and } \nu \in Y\} \cup B_{\eta}^{\ell}[Y]$ , with  $B_{\eta}^{\ell}[Z] \prec M^{\ell}$  moreover  $B_{\eta}^{\ell}[Z] \subseteq_{na} M^{\ell}$  i.e. if  $\bar{a} \subseteq B_{\eta}^{\ell}[Z]$ ,  $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$  is first order and  $(\exists x \in M^{\ell} \setminus \text{acl}(\bar{a})) \varphi(x, \bar{a})$  then  $(\exists x \in B_{\eta}^{\ell}[Z] \setminus \text{acl}(\bar{a})) \varphi(x, \bar{a})$  and  $\{a_{\eta, \langle \alpha \rangle}^{\ell}[Y] : \eta \hat{\ } \langle \alpha \rangle \in I_Y \text{ and } a_{\eta, \langle \alpha \rangle}^{\ell}[Y] \notin B_{\eta}^{\ell}[Z]\}$  is independent over  $(B_{\eta}^{\ell}[Z], A_{\eta}^{\ell}[Y])$
- ( $\epsilon$ ) if  $\eta \in I_Y$ ,  $\ell g(\eta) > m$ , then  $\eta \in I_Z \Leftrightarrow a_{\eta \upharpoonright (m+1)}^{\ell}[Y] \notin B_{\eta \upharpoonright m}^{\ell}[Z]$
- ( $\zeta$ ) if  $\eta \in I_Y \cap I_Z$ ,  $\ell g(\eta) > m$  then  $A_{\eta}^{\ell}[Z] = \text{acl}(A_{\eta}^{\ell}[Y] \cup A_{\eta \upharpoonright m}^{\ell}[Z])$  and  $B_{\eta}^{\ell}[Z] = B_{\eta}^{\ell}[Y]$
- ( $\eta$ ) if  $\eta \in I_Z \setminus I_Y$  then  $\eta^- \in I_Y$  and  $\ell g(\eta) = m + 1$
- ( $\theta$ )  $\{p_{\eta,i}^{\ell}[Z] : i \in W_{k_Z^*-1}^{\ell}\}$  is “rich enough”, e.g. include all finite types over  $A_{\eta}^{\ell}$
- ( $\iota$ )  $\{b_{\eta,i}^{\ell} : i \in W_{k_Z^*-1}^{\ell}\}$  list  $B_{\eta}^{\ell}[Z]$ , each appearing infinitely often.

*Proof.* First we choose  $A_{\eta}^{\ell(*)}[Z]$  for  $\eta \in I$  of length  $m$  according to condition  $(\gamma) = (\gamma)^1 + (\gamma)^2$ . (Note: one of the clauses  $(\gamma)^1, (\gamma)^2$  necessarily holds as trivially  $\bigcup_k W_k \cap \bigcup_k W'_k = \emptyset$ ).

Second, we choose (for such  $\eta$ ) an elementary mapping  $f_{\eta}^Z$  extending  $f_{\eta}^Y$  and a set  $A_{\eta}^{3-\ell(*)}[Z] \subseteq M^{3-\ell(*)}$  satisfying “ $f_{\eta}^Z$  is from  $A_{\eta}^1[Z]$  onto  $A_{\eta}^{3-\ell(*)}[Z]$ ” such that

$$(*)_2 \text{ if } m > 0, \text{ then } f_{\eta}^Z(\text{tp}_{\infty}((A_{\eta}^1[Z]), M_1)) = \text{tp}_{\infty}((A_{\eta}^2[Z]), M_2)$$

$$(*)_3 \text{ if } m = 0, \text{ then } f_{\eta}^Z(\text{tp}_{\infty}(A_{\eta}^1[Z], M_1)) = \text{tp}_{\infty}(A_{\eta}^2[Z], M_2).$$

[Why possible? If we ask just the equality of  $\text{tp}_{\alpha}$  for an ordinal  $\alpha$ , this follows by the first component of  $\text{tp}_{\alpha+1}$ . But (overshooting) for  $\alpha \geq [(\|M_1\| + \|M_2\|)^{\aleph_0}]^+$ , equality of  $\text{tp}_{\alpha}$  implies equality of  $\text{tp}_{\infty}$ ].

Third, we choose  $B_{\eta}^{\ell}[Z]$  for  $\eta \in I_Y$ ,  $\ell g(\eta) = m$  according to condition ( $\delta$ ) (here we use the countability of the language, you can do it by extending it  $\omega$  times) in both sides, i.e. for  $\ell = 1, 2$ .

Fourth, let  $I' = \{\eta \in I : \text{ if } \ell g(\eta) > m \text{ then } a_{\eta \upharpoonright (m+1)}^{\ell}[Y] \notin B_{\eta \upharpoonright m}^{\ell}[Z]\}$  (this will be  $I_Y \cap I_Z$ ).

Fifth, we choose  $A_{\eta}^{\ell}[Z]$  for  $\eta \in I'$ : if  $\ell g(\eta) < m$ , let  $A_{\eta}^{\ell}[Z] = A_{\eta}^{\ell}[Y]$ , if  $\ell g(\eta) = m$  this was done, lastly if  $\ell g(\eta) > m$ , let  $A_{\eta}^{\ell}[Z] = \text{acl}(A_{\eta}^{\ell}[Y] \cup A_{\eta \upharpoonright m}^{\ell}[Z])$ .

Sixth, by induction on  $k \leq n$  we choose  $f_\eta^Z$  for  $\eta \in I'$  of length  $k$ : if  $\ell g(\eta) < m$ , let  $f_\eta^Z = f_\eta^Y$ , if  $\ell g(\eta) = m$  this was done, lastly if  $\ell g(\eta) > m$  choose an elementary mapping from  $A_\eta^1$  onto  $A_{\eta^-}^2$  extending  $f_\eta^Y \cup f_{\eta^-}^Z$  (possible as  $f_\eta^Y \cup f_{\eta^-}^2$  is an elementary mapping and  $\text{Dom}(f_\eta^Y) \cap \text{Dom}(f_{\eta^-}^Z) = A_{\eta^-}^{\ell(*)}$ ,  $\text{Dom}(f_\eta^Y) \cup \text{Dom}(f_{\eta^-}^Z) = A_{\eta^-}^{\ell(*)}$ )

and  $A_{\eta^-}^{\ell(*)} = \text{acl}(A_{\eta^-}^{\ell(*)})$ .) Now  $f_\eta^Z$  satisfies clause (11) of Definition 1.29 when  $\ell g(\eta) > m$  by applying 1.24(2).

Seventh, for  $\eta \in I'$ , of length  $< n_Z$ , let  $v_\eta =: \{\alpha : \eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle \in I\}$ , and we choose  $\{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle}^1[Z] : \alpha \in u_\eta\}$ ,  $[\alpha \in u_\eta \Rightarrow \eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle \notin I]$ , a set of elements of  $M^1$  realizing (stationary) regular types over  $A_\eta^1[Z]$ , orthogonal to  $A_{\eta^-}[Y]$  when  $\ell g(\eta) > 0$ , such that it is independent over  $(\cup\{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle}^1[Y] : \eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle \in I'\} \cup B_\eta^1[Z], A_\eta^1[Z])$  and maximal under those restrictions. Without loss of generality  $\sup(v_\eta) < \min(u_\eta)$  and for  $\alpha_1 \in v_\eta \cup u_\eta$  and  $\alpha_2 \in u_\eta$  we have:

- (\*)<sub>1</sub> if (for the given  $\alpha_2$  and  $\eta$ )  $\alpha_1$  is minimal such that  $\frac{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha_1 \rangle}^1[Z]}{A_\eta^1[Z]} \pm \frac{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha_2 \rangle}^1[Z]}{A_\eta^1[Z]}$  then  $\frac{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha_1 \rangle}^1[Z]}{A_\eta^1[Z]} = \frac{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha_2 \rangle}^1[Z]}{A_\eta^1[Z]}$
- (\*)<sub>2</sub> if  $\alpha_1 < \alpha_{21}$  and  $a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha_1 \rangle}^1[Z]/A_\eta^1[Z] = a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha_2 \rangle}^1[Z]/A_\eta^1[Z]$  and for some  $b \in M^1$  realizing  $\frac{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha_2 \rangle}^1[Z]}{A_\eta^1[Z]}$  we have  $b \not\vdash_{A_\eta^1[Z]} a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha_2 \rangle}^1$  and  $\text{tp}_\infty \left[ \left( \frac{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha_1 \rangle}^1}{A_\eta^1[Z]} \right), M \right] = \text{tp}_\infty \left[ \left( \frac{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha_2 \rangle}^1}{A_\eta^1[Z]} \right), M \right]$  and  $\alpha_1$  is minimal (for the given  $\alpha_2$  and  $\eta$ ) then  $\text{tp}_\infty \left[ \left( \frac{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha_2 \rangle}^1}{A_\eta^1[Z]} \right), M \right] = \text{tp}_\infty \left[ \left( \frac{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha_1 \rangle}^1}{A_\eta^1[Z]} \right), M \right]$ .

Easily (as in [Sh:c, X]) if  $\alpha \in u_\eta$ ,  $\eta^\wedge \langle \beta \rangle \in I'$  then  $\frac{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle}^1[Z]}{A_\eta^1[Z]} \perp \frac{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \beta \rangle}^1[Y]}{A_\eta^1[Y]}$ .

For  $\alpha \in u_\eta$  let  $A_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle}^1[Z] = \text{acl} \left( A_\eta^1[Y] \cup \{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle}^1[Z]\} \right)$ .

Eighth, by the second component in the definition of  $\text{tp}_{\alpha+1}$  (see Definition 1.6) we can choose (for  $\alpha \in u_\eta$ )  $a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle}^2[Z]$ ,  $A_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle}^2[Z]$  and then  $f_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle}^Z$  as required (see (7) of Definition 1.29).

Ninth and lastly, we let  $I_Z = I' \cup \{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle : \eta \in I', \ell g(\eta) < n_Z \text{ and } \alpha \in u_\eta\}$  and we choose  $B_\eta^\ell$  for  $\eta \in I_Z \setminus I_Y$  and the  $p_{\eta,i}^\ell, b_{\eta,j}^\ell$  as required (also in other case left).

□<sub>1.32</sub>

*1.33 Finishing the Proof of 1.11.* We define by induction on  $n < \omega$  an approximation  $Y_n = Y(n)$ . Let  $Y_0$  be the trivial one (as in the proof of 1.27(C)).

$Y_{n+1}$  is gotten from  $Y_n$  as in 1.32 for  $m_n, i_n \leq n, \ell_n(*) \in \{1, 2\}$  defined by reasonable bookkeeping (so  $i_n \in \bigcup_{k < k_{Y(n)}^*} (W_k \cup W'_k)$  such that any triples appear



infinitely often); without loss of generality: if  $n_1 < n_2$  &  $\eta \in I_{n_1}^\ell \cap I_{n_2}^\ell$  then  

$$\eta \in \bigcap_{n=n_1}^{n_2} I_n.$$

Let  $I^* = \lim(I_\ell^{Y(n)}) =: \{\eta : \text{for every large enough } n, \eta \in I_n\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for } \eta \in I^* \text{ let: } A_\eta^\ell[*] &= \bigcup_{n < \omega} A_\eta^\ell[Y_n], f_\eta^\ell[*] = \bigcup_{n < \omega} f_\eta^{Y(n)} \text{ and} \\ B_\eta^\ell[*] &= \bigcup_{n < \omega} B_\eta^\ell[Y_n]. \end{aligned}$$

Easily

$$\oplus_1 \text{ for } \eta \in I^*, \langle B_\eta^\ell[Y_n] : n < \omega \text{ and } \eta \in I[Y_n] \rangle \text{ is an increasing sequence of } \subseteq_{na}\text{-elementary submodels of } M^\ell$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} \oplus_2 \text{ for } \eta \in I^*, B_\eta^\ell[*] &\subseteq_{na} M^\ell \\ \oplus_3 \nu \triangleleft \eta \in I^* &\Rightarrow B_\nu^\ell[*] \subseteq B_\eta^\ell[*]. \end{aligned}$$

[Why? Because for infinitely many  $n, m_n = \ell g(\eta)$  and clause  $(\delta)$  of Main Fact 1.32].

$$\oplus_4 \text{ if } \eta \in I[Y_{n_1}] \cap I^*, \eta^- = \nu \text{ and } n_1 \leq n_2 \text{ then}$$

$$A_\eta^\ell[Y_{n_1}] \cup A_\nu^\ell[Y_{n_2}] = A_\nu^\ell[Y_{n_1}].$$

[Why? Prove by induction on  $n_2$  (using the non-forking calculus), for  $n_2 = n_1$  this is trivial, so assume  $n_2 > n_1$ . If  $m_{(n_2-1)} > \ell g(\nu)$  we have  $A_\nu^\ell[Y_{n_2}] = A_\nu^\ell[Y_{n_2-1}]$  (see 1.32 and we have nothing to prove. If  $m_{(n_2-1)} < \ell g(\nu)$  then we note that  $A_\nu^\ell[Y_{n_2}] = \text{acl}(A_\nu^\ell[Y_{n_2-1}] \cup A_{\nu \upharpoonright m_{(n_2-1)}}^\ell[Y_{n_2}])$  and  $A_\nu^\ell[Y_{n_2-1}] \cup A_{\nu \upharpoonright m_{(n_2-1)}}^\ell[Y_{n_2}] = A_\nu^\ell[Y_{n_2-1}] \cup A_{\nu \upharpoonright m_{(n_2-1)}}^\ell[Y_{n_2}]$  (as  $\nu \in A_{\nu \upharpoonright m_{(n_2-1)}}^\ell$ )

$I[Y_{n_2}]$ , by 1.32 clause  $(\delta)$  last phrase) and now use clauses (5), (6) of Definition 1.32. Lastly if  $m_{(n_2-1)} = \ell g(\nu)$  again use  $\nu \in I[Y_{n_2}]$  by 1.32, clause  $(\delta)$ , last phrase].

$$\oplus_5 \text{ if } \eta \in I[Y_{n_1}] \cap I^*, \eta^- = \nu \text{ and } n_1 \leq n_2 \text{ then}$$

$$\frac{A_\eta^\ell[*]}{A_\nu^\ell[*] + a_\eta^\ell[*]} \perp_a A_\nu^\ell.$$

[Why? By clause (6) of Definition 1.29, and orthogonality calculus].

$$\begin{aligned} \oplus_6 \text{ if } \eta \in I^*, \text{ then } A_\eta^\ell[*] &\subseteq B_\eta^\ell[*] \prec M^\ell \text{ moreover} \\ \otimes_7 A_{\eta(*)}^\ell[*] &\subseteq_{na} B_\eta^\ell[*] \subseteq_{na} M^\ell. \end{aligned}$$

[Why? The second relation holds by  $\otimes_2$ . The first relation we prove by induction on  $\ell g(\eta)$ ; clearly  $A_\eta^\ell[*] = \text{acl}(A_\eta^\ell[*])$  by clause (3) of Definition 1.29; we prove this by induction on  $m = \ell g(\eta)$ , so suppose this is true for every  $m' < m, m = \ell g(\eta), \eta \in I^*$ ,

let  $\varphi(x)$  be a formula with parameters in  $A_\eta^\ell[*]$  realized in  $M^\ell$  as above say by  $b \in M^\ell$  for some  $n, b \bigcup_{A_\eta^\ell[Y_n]} A_\eta^\ell[*]$ .

So  $\{\varphi(x)\} = p_{\eta,i}^\ell$  for some  $i$  and for some  $n' > n$  defining  $Y(n+1)$  we have used 1.32 with  $(\ell(*), i, m)$  there being  $(\ell, i, \ell g(\eta))$  here, so we consider clause  $(\gamma)^2$  of 1.32. So the case left is when the assumption of both clauses (a) and (b) of  $(\gamma)^2$  fail, so we have  $\ell g(\eta) > 0$  and

$$b' \notin A_\eta^\ell[Y_{n'}], b' \in M^\ell \models \varphi[b'] \Rightarrow \frac{b'}{A_\eta^\ell[Y_{n'}]} \pm A_{\eta-}^\ell[Y_{n'}].$$

We can now use the induction hypothesis (and [BeSh 307, 5.3,p.292]).

$\oplus_8$  if  $\eta \in I^*$  and  $\ell = 1, 2$ , then  
 $\{a_{\eta^{\wedge} \langle \alpha \rangle}^\ell : \eta^{\wedge} \langle \alpha \rangle \in I^*\}$  is a maximal subset of

$$\{c \in M_\ell : \frac{c}{A_\eta^\ell[*]} \text{ regular, } c \bigcup_{A_\eta^\ell[*]} B_\eta^\ell[*] \text{ and } \ell g(\eta) > 0 \Rightarrow \frac{c}{A_\eta^\ell[*]} \perp A_{\eta-}^\ell[*]\}$$

independent over  $(A_\eta^\ell[*], B_\eta^\ell[*])$ .

[Why? Note clause (7) of Definition 1.29 and clause  $(\delta)$  of Main Fact 1.32].

$$\otimes_9 A_{<>}^\ell[*] = B_{<>}^\ell[*]$$

[Why? By the bookkeeping every  $b \in B_{<>}^\ell[*]$  is considered for addition to  $A_{<>}^\ell[*]$  see 1.32, clause  $(\gamma)^1$ , subclause (b)(i) and for  $\langle \rangle$  there is nothing to stop us].

$\otimes_{10}$  if  $\eta \in I^*$  and  $p \in S(A_\eta^\ell[*])$  is orthogonal to  $A_{\eta-}^\ell[*]$  then  $\frac{B_\eta^\ell[*]}{A_\eta^\ell[*]} \perp p$   
 [why? if not, as  $A_\eta^\ell[*] \subseteq B_\eta^\ell[*]$  by [BeSh 307, Th.B,p.277] there is  $c \in B_\eta^\ell[*] \setminus A_\eta^\ell[*]$  such that:  $\frac{c}{A_\eta^\ell[*]}$  is  $p$ . As  $c \in B_\eta^\ell[*] = \bigcup_{n < \omega} B_\eta^\ell[Y_n]$ , for every  $n < \omega$  large enough  $c \in B_\eta^\ell[Y_n]$ , and  $p$  does not fork over  $A_\eta^\ell[Y_n]$ . So for some such  $n$  the triple  $(i_n, \ell_n, m_n)$  is such that  $\ell_n = \ell, m_n = \ell g(\eta)$  and  $b_{\eta, i_n}^\ell = c$ , so by clause  $(\gamma)^1$ (b)(ii) of 1.32 we have  $c \in A_\eta^\ell[Y_n] \subseteq A_\eta^\ell[*]$ .]  
 $\otimes_{11}$  if  $\eta \in I^*, \ell \in \{1, 2\}$  then  $\{a_{\eta^{\wedge} \langle \alpha \rangle}^\ell : \eta^{\wedge} \langle \alpha \rangle \in I^*\}$  is a maximal subset of  $\{c \in M^\ell : \frac{c}{A_\eta^\ell[*]} \text{ regular, } \perp A_{\eta-}^\ell[*] \text{ when meaningful}\}$  independent over  $A_\eta^\ell[*]$ .

[Why? If not, then for some  $c \in M, \{a_{\eta^{\wedge} \langle \alpha \rangle}^\ell : \eta^{\wedge} \langle \alpha \rangle \in I^*\} \cup \{c\}$  is independent over  $A_\eta^\ell[*]$  and  $\text{tp}(c, A_\eta^\ell[*])$  is regular (and stationary). Hence by  $\otimes_{10}$  we have  $\{a_{\eta^{\wedge} \langle \alpha \rangle}^\ell : \eta^{\wedge} \langle \alpha \rangle \in I^*\} \cup \{c\}$  is independent over  $(A_\eta^\ell[*], B_\eta^\ell[*])$ . Now for large enough  $n$  we have  $c \bigcup_{A_\eta^\ell[Y_n]} A_\eta^\ell[*]$  and by  $\otimes_{10}$  we have  $c \bigcup_{A_\eta^\ell[Y_n]} B_\eta^\ell[*]$ , hence  $c \bigcup_{A_\eta^\ell[Y_n]} B_\eta^\ell[Y_n]$ , hence  $\{c\} \cup \{a_{\eta^{\wedge} \langle \alpha \rangle}^\ell[Y_n] : \eta^{\wedge} \langle \alpha \rangle \in I[Y_n]\}$  is not independent over  $(A_\eta^\ell[Y_n], B_\eta^\ell[Y_n])$ , but  $\{a_{\eta^{\wedge} \langle \alpha \rangle}^\ell[Y_n] : \eta^{\wedge} \langle \alpha \rangle \in I[Y_n]\}$  is independent over  $(A_\eta^\ell[Y_n], B_\eta^\ell[Y_n])$ . So there is a

finite set  $w$  of ordinals such that  $\alpha \in w \Rightarrow \eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle \in I[Y_n]$  and  $\{c\} \cup \{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle}^\ell[Y_n] : \alpha \in w\}$  is not independent over  $(A_\eta^\ell[Y_n], B_\eta^\ell[Y_n])$ , and without loss of generality  $w$  is minimal. Now  $\{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle}^\ell[*] : \eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle \in I^*\} \cup B_\eta^\ell[*]$  include  $\{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle}^\ell[Y_n] : \eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle \in I[Y_n]\}$  hence it includes  $\{a_{\eta^\wedge \langle \alpha \rangle}^\ell[Y_n] : \alpha \in \omega\}$ , easy contradiction.]

$$\oplus_{12} f_\eta^* = \bigcup_{m < \omega} f_\eta[Y_n] \text{ (for } \eta \in I^*) \text{ is an elementary map from } A_\eta^1[*] \text{ onto } A_\eta^2[*].$$

[Easy].

$$\oplus_{13} \bigcup_{\eta \in I^*} f_\eta^* \text{ is an elementary mapping from } \bigcup_{\eta \in I^*} A_\eta^1[*] \text{ onto } \bigcup_{\eta \in I^*} A_\eta^2[*].$$

[Clear using by  $\otimes_5 + \otimes_6$  and non-forking calculus].

$$\begin{aligned} \oplus_{14} \text{ We can find } \langle d_\alpha^\ell : \alpha < \alpha(*) \rangle \text{ such that: } d_\alpha^\ell \in M^\ell, \\ \text{tp}(d_\alpha^\ell, \bigcup_{\eta \in I[*]} A_\eta^\ell[*] \cup \{d_\beta^\ell : \beta < \alpha\}) \text{ is } \aleph_\epsilon \text{-isolated and } \mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^\ell \text{-isolated, and} \\ g_\alpha = \bigcup_{\eta \in I^*} f_\eta^* \cup \{(\langle d_\alpha^1, d_\alpha^2 \rangle : \alpha < \alpha(*)\}) \text{ is an elementary mapping, } \alpha(*) \text{ is} \\ \text{maximal.} \end{aligned}$$

[Why? We can choose by induction on  $\alpha$ , a member  $d_\alpha^1$  of  $M^1 \setminus \bigcup_{\eta \in I[*]} \cup \{d_\beta^1 : \beta < \alpha\}$

such that  $\text{tp}(d_\alpha^1, \bigcup_{\eta \in I[*]} A_\eta^\ell[*] \cup \{d_\beta^1 : \beta < \alpha\})$  is  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -isolated and  $\mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^\ell$ -isolated. So for

some  $\alpha(*)$ ,  $d_\alpha^1$  is well defined iff  $\alpha < \alpha(*)$  (as  $\beta < \alpha \Rightarrow d_\beta^1 \neq d_\alpha^1 \in M^1$ ). Now choose by induction on  $\alpha < \alpha(*)$ ,  $d_\alpha^2 \in M^2$  as required above, possible by “ $M_i^2$  being  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated (see [Sh:c, XII,2.1,p.591], [Sh:c, IV,3.10,p.179].]

$$\otimes_{15} \text{ Dom}(g_{\alpha(*)}), \text{Rang}(g_{\alpha(*)}) \text{ are universes of elementary submodels of } M^1, M^2 \text{ respectively called } M'_1, M'_2 \text{ respectively.}$$

[Why? See [Sh:c, XII,1.2(2),p.591] and the proof of  $\otimes_{14}$ ].

$$\otimes_{16} M^\ell \neq M'_\ell \text{ then for some } d \in M_\ell \setminus M'_\ell, \frac{d}{M'_\ell} \text{ is regular.}$$

[Why? By [BeSh 307, Th.5.9,p.298] as  $N_\eta^\ell \subseteq_{na} M^\ell$  by  $\otimes_7$ ].

$$\begin{aligned} \otimes_{17} \text{ if } M^\ell \neq M'_\ell \text{ then for some } \eta \in I^*, \text{ there is } d \in M^\ell \setminus M'_\ell, \frac{d}{A_\eta^\ell[*]} \text{ is regular,} \\ d \bigcup_{A_\eta^\ell[*]} M'_\ell, \left[ \ell g(\eta) > 0 \Rightarrow \frac{d}{A_\eta^\ell[*]} \perp A_{\eta^-}^\ell[*] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

[Why? By [Sh:c, XII,1.4,p.529] every non-algebraic  $p \in S(M'_\ell)$  is not orthogonal to some  $A_\eta^\ell[*]$  so by  $\otimes_{16}$  we can choose  $\eta \in I^*$  and  $d \in M^\ell \setminus M'_\ell$  such that  $\frac{d}{M'_\ell}$  regular  $\perp A_\eta^\ell[*]$ ; without loss of generality  $\ell g(\eta)$  is minimal, now  $A_\eta^\ell[*] \subseteq_{na} M^\ell$  and by [BeSh 307, 4.5,p.290] without loss of generality  $d \bigcup_{A_\eta^\ell[*]} M'_\ell$ ; the last clause is by

“ $\ell g(\eta)$  minimal”].

$$\oplus_{18} M_\ell = M'_\ell.$$

[Why? By  $\oplus_{11} + \oplus_{17}$ ].

$\oplus_{19}$  there is an isomorphism from  $M_1$  onto  $M_2$  extending  

$$\bigcup_{\eta \in I^*} f_\eta^*.$$

[Why? By  $\oplus_{14} + \otimes_{15}$  we have  $M'_1 \cong M'_2$ , so by  $\otimes_{18}$  we are done].  $\square_{1.33} \square_{1.27}$

**1.34 Lemma.** Assume  $B \overset{A}{\cup} C, A = \text{acl}(A) = B \cap C$  and  $A, B, C$  are  $\epsilon$ -finite,  $A \cup B \cup C \subseteq M, M$  an  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated model of  $T$ . For notational simplicity make  $A$  a set of individual constants.

Then  $tp_{\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}(d.q.)}(B + C; M) = tp_{\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}(d.q.)}(B; M) + tp_{\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}(d.q.)}[C; M]$   
 where

**1.35 Definition.** 1) For any logic  $\mathcal{L}$  let,  $\bar{b}$  a sequence from a model  $M$ ,

$$tp_{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{b}; M) = \left\{ \varphi(\bar{x}) : M \models \varphi[B], \varphi \text{ a formula in the vocabulary of } M, \right. \\ \left. \begin{array}{l} \text{from the logic } \mathcal{L} \text{ (with free variables from} \\ \bar{x}, \text{ where } \bar{x} = \langle x_i : i < \ell g(\bar{b}) \rangle \end{array} \right\}.$$

2) Replacing  $\bar{b}$  by a set  $B$  means we use the variables  $\langle x_b : b \in B \rangle$ .

3) Saying  $p_1 = p_2 + p_3$  in 1.34 means that we can compute  $p_1$  from  $p_2$  and  $p_3$  (and the knowledge how the variables fit and the knowledge of  $T$ , of course).

*Proof of the Lemma 1.34.*

It is enough to prove:

**1.36 Claim.** Assume

- (a)  $M^1, M^2$  are  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated and
- (b)  $A_1^\ell \overset{A_0^\ell}{\cup} A_2^\ell$
- (c)  $A_0^\ell = \text{acl}(A_0^\ell)$  and  $A_i^\ell$  is  $\epsilon$ -finite for  $\ell = 1, 2$  and  $i < 3$
- (d) for  $m = 0, 1, 2$  we have  $f_m : A_m^1 \xrightarrow{\text{onto}} A_m^2$  is an elementary mapping preserving  $tp_\infty$  (in  $M^1, M^2$  respectively) and
- (e)  $f_0 \subseteq f_1, f_2$ .

Then there is an isomorphism from  $M^1$  onto  $M^2$  extending  $f_1 \cup f_2$ .

*Proof of 1.36.* Repeat the proof of 1.4, but starting with  $Y_0$  such that  $A_\eta^\ell[Y_0] = A_0^\ell, A_\eta^\ell[Y_0] = A_1^\ell, A_{<1>}^\ell[Y_0] = A_2^\ell, f_{<>}^{Y_0} = f_0, f_{<0>}^{Y_0} = f_1, f_{<1>}^{Y_0} = f_2$  and that  $\langle \rangle, \langle 0 \rangle, \langle 1 \rangle$  belongs to all  $I[Y_0]$ . During the construction we preserve  $\langle 0 \rangle, \langle 1 \rangle \in I[Y_n]$  and for this  $B_{<>}^\ell[Y_n] \overset{A_0^\ell}{\cup} A_1^\ell \cup A_2^\ell$  [you can use  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturation!].  $\square_{1.34}$

## §2 FINER TYPES

We shall use here alternative types showing us probably a finer way to manipulate tp.

*2.1 Convention.*  $T$  is superstable, NDOP  
 $M, N$  are  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated  $\prec \mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$ .

**2.2 Definition.**  $\Gamma_p = \left\{ \left( \frac{\bar{b}}{\bar{a}} \right) : \bar{a} \subseteq \bar{b} \text{ are } \epsilon\text{-finite} \right\}$   
 $\Gamma_r = \left\{ \left( \frac{p}{\bar{a}} \right) : \bar{a} \text{ is } \epsilon\text{-finite, } p \in S(\bar{a}) \text{ is regular (so stationary)} \right\}$

$\Gamma_{pr} = \left\{ \left( \frac{p, r}{\bar{a}} \right) : \bar{a} \text{ is } \epsilon\text{-finite, } p \text{ is a regular type of depth } > 0, \right.$   
 $p \pm \bar{a}$  (really only the equivalence class  $p/\pm$  matters),  
 $r = r(x, \bar{y}) \in S(\bar{a})$  is such that for  $(c, \bar{b})$  realizing  $r$ ,  
 $c/(\bar{a} + \bar{b})$  is regular  $\pm p$ , and  $\frac{\bar{b}}{\bar{a}} = (r \upharpoonright \bar{y}) \pm p \left. \right\}$ .

We may add (to  $\Gamma_x$ ) superscripts:

- ( $\alpha$ )  $f$  if  $\bar{a}$  (or  $\bar{a}, \bar{b}$ ) is finite
- ( $\beta$ )  $s$  : for  $\Gamma_p$  if  $\frac{\bar{b}}{\bar{a}}$  is stationary, for  $\Gamma_r$  if  $p$  is stationary and for  $\Gamma_{pr}$  if  $r$  is stationary and every automorphism of  $\mathfrak{C}$  over  $\bar{a}$  fix  $p/\pm$
- ( $\gamma$ )  $c$  if  $\bar{a}$  (or  $\bar{a}, \bar{b}$ ) are algebraically closed.

**2.3 Claim.** *If  $p$  is regular of depth  $> 0$  and  $p \pm \bar{a}$  and  $\bar{a}$  is  $\epsilon$ -finite then for some  $\bar{a}', \bar{a} \subseteq \bar{a}' \subseteq \text{acl}(\bar{a})$  and for some  $q$  we have  $\left( \frac{p, q}{\bar{a}} \right) \in \Gamma_{pr}^s$ .*

*[Why? Use e.g. [Sh:c, V, 4.11, p.272] assume  $\frac{\bar{b}}{\bar{a}} \pm p$ ; we can define inductively equivalence relations  $E_n$ , with parameters from  $\text{acl}(\bar{a}^\ell)$ ,  $\bar{a}^\ell = \bar{a} \wedge (\bar{b}/E_0) \wedge \dots \wedge (\bar{b}/E_{n-1})$ , such that  $\text{tp}(\bar{b}/E_n, \text{acl}(\bar{a}^n))$  is semi-regular. By superstability this stop for some  $n$  hence  $\bar{b} \subseteq \text{acl}(\bar{a}^n)$ . For some first  $m$   $\text{tp}(\bar{b}/E_m, \text{acl}(\bar{a}^n))$  is  $\pm p$ , by [Sh:c, X, 7.3(5), p.552] the type is regular (as because  $p$  is trivial having depth  $> 0$ ; see [Sh:c, X, 7.2, p.551].*

**2.4 Definition.** We define by induction on an ordinal  $\alpha$  the following (simultaneously): note — if a definition of something depends on another which is not well defined, neither is the something)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tp}_\alpha^1 \left[ \left( \frac{p}{\bar{a}} \right), M \right] & \quad \text{for} \quad \left( \frac{p}{\bar{a}} \right) \in \Gamma_r, \bar{a} \subseteq M \\ \text{tp}_\alpha^2 \left[ \left( \frac{p, r}{\bar{a}} \right), M \right] & \quad \text{for} \quad \left( \frac{p, r}{\bar{a}} \right) \in \Gamma_r, \bar{a} \subseteq M \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{tp}_\alpha^3 \left[ \begin{pmatrix} \bar{b} \\ \bar{a} \end{pmatrix}, M \right] \quad \text{for} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \bar{b} \\ \bar{a} \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma_{p, \bar{a}}^c, \bar{a} \subseteq \bar{b} \subseteq M$$

Case A  $\alpha = 0$ :  $\text{tp}_\alpha^1 \left[ \begin{pmatrix} p \\ \bar{a} \end{pmatrix}, M \right]$  is  $\text{tp}((c, \bar{a}), \emptyset)$  for any  $c$  realizing  $p$ .

$$\text{tp}_\alpha^2 \left[ \begin{pmatrix} p, r \\ \bar{a} \end{pmatrix}, M \right] \text{ is } \text{tp}((c, \bar{b}, \bar{a}), \emptyset) \text{ for any } (c, \bar{b}) \text{ realizing } r$$

$$\text{tp}_\alpha^3 \left[ \begin{pmatrix} \bar{b} \\ \bar{a} \end{pmatrix}, M \right] \text{ is } \text{tp}((\bar{b}, \bar{a}), \emptyset).$$

Case B  $\alpha = \beta + 1$ :

(1)  $\text{tp}_\alpha^1 \left[ \begin{pmatrix} p \\ \bar{a} \end{pmatrix}, M \right]$  is:

Subcase B1 if  $p$  has depth zero, it is  $w_p(M/\bar{a})$  (the  $p$ -weight, equivalently, the dimension)

Subcase B2 if  $p$  has depth  $> 0$  (hence is trivial), then it is  $\{\langle y, \lambda_{\bar{a}, p}^y \rangle : y\}$  where

$$\lambda_{\bar{a}, p}^y = \dim(\mathcal{I}_{\bar{a}, p}^y[M], a) \text{ where } \mathcal{I}_{\bar{a}, p}^y[M] = \left\{ c \in M : c \text{ realize } p \text{ and } y = \text{tp}_\beta^3 \left[ \begin{pmatrix} \text{acl}(\bar{a} + c) \\ \text{acl}(\bar{a}) \end{pmatrix}, M \right] \right\}$$

an alternative probably more transparent and simpler in use:

$$\lambda_{\bar{a}, p}^y = \dim \left\{ c \in M : \text{realizes } p \text{ and } y = \left\{ \text{tp}_\beta^3 \left[ \begin{pmatrix} \text{acl}(\bar{a} + c') \\ \text{acl}(\bar{a}) \end{pmatrix}, M \right] : c' \in p(M) \text{ and } c' \underset{\bar{a}}{\parallel} c \right\} \right\}.$$

(2)  $\text{tp}_\alpha^2 \left[ \begin{pmatrix} p, r \\ \bar{a} \end{pmatrix}, M \right]$  is:

$$\text{tp}_\alpha^1 \left[ \begin{pmatrix} c/\bar{b}^+ \\ \bar{b}^+ \end{pmatrix}, M \right] \text{ for any } (c, \bar{b}) \text{ realizing } r, \bar{b}^+ = \text{acl}(\bar{a} + \bar{b}) \text{ (so not well defined if we get at least two different cases; so remember } c/\bar{b}^+ \in S(\bar{b}^+)).$$

(3)  $\text{tp}_\alpha^3 \left[ \begin{pmatrix} \bar{b} \\ \bar{a} \end{pmatrix}, M \right]$  is  $\left\{ \langle p, \text{tp}_\alpha^2 \left[ \begin{pmatrix} p, r \\ \bar{b} \end{pmatrix}, M \right] \rangle : \begin{pmatrix} p, r \\ \bar{b} \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma_{pr}^s \text{ and } : p \pm \bar{a} \right\}.$

Case C  $\alpha$  limit: For any  $\ell \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  and suitable object  $OB$ :

$$\text{tp}_\alpha^\ell[OB, M] = \langle \text{tp}_\beta^\ell[OB, M] : \beta < \alpha \rangle.$$

**2.5 Definition.** 1) For  $(\frac{p}{\bar{a}}) \in \Gamma_r$  where  $\bar{a} \in M$ , let (remembering 1.10(8)):

$$\mathcal{P}_{(\frac{p}{\bar{a}})}^M = \left\{ q \in M : q \text{ regular and } : q \pm p \text{ or for some } \right. \\ \left. c \in p(M), q \in \mathcal{P}_{(\frac{c}{\bar{a}})}^M \right\}.$$

2) For  $(\frac{p,r}{\bar{a}}) \in \Gamma_{pr}$  let

$$\mathcal{P}_{(\frac{p,r}{\bar{a}})}^M = \left\{ q \in S(M) : q \text{ regular and } : q \pm p \text{ or for some } \right. \\ \left. (c, \bar{b}) \in r(M), q \in \mathcal{P}_{(\frac{c}{\bar{a}+\bar{b}})}^M \right\}.$$

3) For a set  $\mathcal{P}$  is stationary regular types not orthogonal to  $M_1$ , let  $M_1 \leq_{\mathcal{P}} M_2$  means  $M_1 \prec M_2$  and for every  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $\bar{c} \in M_2$ ,  $\frac{\bar{c}}{M_1} \perp p$ .

4) If (in (3)),  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{(\frac{p}{\bar{a}})}^{M_1}$  we may write  $(\frac{p}{\bar{a}})$  instead  $\mathcal{P}$ , similarly if  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{(\frac{p,r}{\bar{a}})}^{M_1}$  we may write  $(\frac{p,r}{\bar{a}})$ .

**2.6 Claim.** :

1) From  $tp_{\alpha}^1[(\frac{p}{\bar{a}}), M]$  we can compute  $tp_{\infty}^1[(\frac{p}{\bar{a}}), M]$  if  $Dp(p) < \alpha$ .

2) From  $tp_{\alpha}^2[(\frac{p,q}{\bar{a}}), M]$  we can compute  $tp_{\infty}^2[(\frac{p,q}{\bar{a}}), M]$  if  $Dp(p) < \alpha$ .

3) From  $tp_{\alpha}^3[(\frac{\bar{b}}{\bar{a}}), M]$  we can compute  $tp_{\infty}^3[(\frac{\bar{b}}{\bar{a}}), M]$  if  $Dp(\bar{b}/\bar{a}) < \alpha$ .

*Proof.* By the definition.

**2.7 Observation.** From  $tp_{\alpha}^{\ell}(OB, M)$  we can compute  $tp_{\beta}^{\ell}[OB, M]$  if  $\beta \leq \alpha$  and the former is well defined.

**2.8 Lemma.** For every ordinal  $\alpha$  the following holds:

- (1)  $tp_{\alpha}^1$  is well defined<sup>1</sup>
- (2)  $tp_{\alpha}^2$  is well defined.
- (3)  $tp_{\alpha}^3$  is well defined.
- (4) If  $\bar{a} \in M_1$ ,  $(\frac{p}{\bar{a}}) \in \Gamma_r$ ,  $M_1 \leq_{(\frac{p}{\bar{a}})} M_2$  then  
 $tp_{\alpha}^1[(\frac{p}{\bar{a}}), M_1] = tp_{\alpha}^1[(\frac{p}{\bar{a}}), M_2]$ .
- (5) If  $\bar{a} \in M_1$ ,  $(\frac{p,r}{\bar{a}}) \in \Gamma_{pr}^s$ ,  $M_1 \leq_{(\frac{p}{\bar{a}})} M_2$  then  
 $tp_{\alpha}^2[(\frac{p,r}{\bar{a}}), M_1] = tp_{\alpha}^2[(\frac{p,r}{\bar{a}}), M_2]$ .
- (6) If  $\bar{a} \subseteq \bar{b} \subseteq M_1$ ,  $(\frac{\bar{b}}{\bar{a}}) \in \Gamma_p^c$ ,  $M_1 \leq_{(\frac{\bar{b}}{\bar{a}})} M_2$  then  
 $tp_{\alpha}^3[(\frac{\bar{b}}{\bar{a}}), M_1] = tp_{\alpha}^3[(\frac{\bar{b}}{\bar{a}}), M_2]$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>i.e. in all the cases we have tried to define it in Definition 2.9

*Proof.* We prove it, by induction on  $\alpha$ , simultaneously (for all clauses and parameters).

If  $\alpha$  is zero, they hold trivially by the definition.

If  $\alpha$  is limit, they hold trivially by the definition and induction hypothesis.

So for the rest of the proof let  $\alpha = \beta + 1$ .

*Proof of (1) $_\alpha$ .* If  $p$  has depth zero — check directly.

If  $p$  has depth  $> 0$  - by (3) $_\beta$

(i.e. induction hypothesis) no problem.

*Proof of (2) $_\alpha$ .* Like 1.24 (and (4) $_\alpha$ ).

*Proof of (3) $_\alpha$ .* Like (2) $_\alpha$ .

*Proof of (4) $_\alpha$ .* Like 1.23 (and (3) $_\beta$ , (6) $_\beta$ ).

*Proof of (5) $_\alpha$ .* By (2) $_\alpha$  we can look only at  $(c, \bar{b}^+)$  in  $M_1$ , then use (4) $_\alpha$ .

*Proof of (6) $_\alpha$ .* By (5) $_\alpha$ .

□<sub>2.8</sub>

**2.9 Lemma.** *For an ordinal  $\alpha$  restricting ourselves to the cases (the types  $p, p_1$  being) of depth  $< \alpha$ :*

(A1) Assume  $\binom{p}{\bar{a}} \in \Gamma_r, \bar{a} \subseteq \bar{a}_1 \subseteq M, \bar{a}_1$  is  $\epsilon$ -finite,  $\frac{\bar{a}_1}{\bar{a}} \perp p$  and  $p_1$  is the stationarization of  $p$  over  $\bar{a}_1$ .

Then from  $tp_\alpha^1[\binom{p}{\bar{a}}, M]$  we can compute  $tp_\alpha^1[\binom{p_1}{\bar{a}_1}, M]$ .

(A2) Under the assumption of (A1) all the inverse computations are O.K.

(A3) Assume  $\binom{p_\ell}{\bar{a}} \in \Gamma_r$  for  $\ell = 1, 2, \bar{a} \subseteq M$  and  $p_1 \pm p_2$ .

Then from  $tp_\alpha^1[\binom{p_1}{\bar{a}_1}, M]$  we can compute  $tp_\alpha^1[\binom{p_2}{\bar{a}}, M]$ .

(B1) Assume  $\binom{p_\ell, r_\ell}{\bar{a}} \in \Gamma_{pr}^{sc}$  for  $\ell = 1, 2, \bar{a} \in M$  and  $p_1 \pm p_2$ .

Then (from the first order information on  $\bar{a}, p_1, p_2, r_1, r_2$ , of course, and)  $tp_\alpha^2[\binom{p, r_2}{\bar{a}}, M]$  we can compute  $tp_\alpha^2[\binom{p, r_1}{\bar{a}}, M]$ .

(B2) Assume  $\bar{a} \subseteq \bar{a}_1 \subseteq M, \frac{\bar{a}_1}{\bar{a}} \pm p, \binom{p, r}{\bar{a}} \in \Gamma_{pr}^{cs}, r \subseteq r_1 \in S(\bar{a}_1), r_1$  does not fork over  $\bar{a}$ , (so  $\binom{p, r_1}{\bar{a}_1} \in \Gamma_{pr}$ ).

Then from  $tp_\alpha^2[\binom{p, r_1}{\bar{a}}, M]$  we can compute  $tp_\alpha^2[\binom{p, r_2}{\bar{a}}, M]$ .

(B3) Under the assumption of (B2), the inverse computation are O.K.

(C1) Assume  $\binom{\bar{b}}{\bar{a}} \in \Gamma^c, \bar{a} \subseteq \bar{b} \subseteq M, \bar{a} \subseteq \bar{a}_1, \bar{b} \bigcup_{\bar{a}} \bar{a}_1, \bar{b}_1 = acl(\bar{a}_1 + \bar{b})$ .

Then from  $tp_\alpha^3[\binom{\bar{b}}{\bar{a}}, M]$  we can compute  $tp_\alpha^3[\binom{\bar{b}_1}{\bar{a}_1}, M]$ .

(C2) Under the assumptions of (C1) the inverse computation is O.K.

(C3) Assume  $\binom{\bar{b}}{\bar{a}} \in \Gamma_p, \bar{b} \subseteq b^*, \frac{\bar{b}^*}{\bar{b}} \perp_a \bar{a}, \bar{b}^* = acl(\bar{b}^*)$ . Then from  $tp_\alpha^3[\binom{\bar{b}}{\bar{a}}, M]$  we can compute

$\left\{ tp_\alpha^3[\binom{\bar{b}'}{\bar{a}}, M] : \bar{b} \subseteq b' \subseteq M \text{ and } \frac{\bar{b}'}{\bar{b}} = \frac{\bar{b}^*}{\bar{b}} \right\}$ .



*Proof.* We prove it, simultaneously, for all clauses and parameters, by induction on  $\alpha$  and the order of the clauses.

For  $\alpha = 0$ : easy.

For  $\alpha$  limit: very easy.

So assume  $\alpha = \beta + 1$ .

*Proof of  $(A1)_\alpha$ .* As  $p$  is stationary  $\perp \frac{\bar{a}_1}{\bar{a}}$ , for every  $c \in p(M)$ ,  $\frac{c}{\bar{a}} \vdash \frac{c}{\bar{a}_1}$ , which necessarily is  $p_1$ , hence  $p(M) = p_1(M)$ . Also the dependency relation on  $p(M)$  is the same over  $\bar{a}_1$ , hence dimension. So it suffices to show:

$$(*) \text{ for } c \in p(M), \text{ from } \text{tp}_\beta^3 \left[ \left( \frac{acl(\bar{a}+c)}{acl \bar{a}} \right), M \right] \text{ we can compute } \text{tp}_\beta^3 \left[ \left( \frac{acl(\bar{a}_1+c)}{acl \bar{a}_1} \right), M \right].$$

But this holds by  $(C1)_\beta$ .

*Proof of  $(A2)_\alpha$ .* Similar using  $(C2)_\beta$ .

*Proof of  $(A3)_\alpha$ .* If  $p_1$  (equivalently  $p_2$ ) has depth zero — the dimensions are equal. Assume they have depth  $> 0$  hence are trivial and dependency over  $\bar{a}$  is an equivalence relation on  $p_1(M) \cup p_2(M)$ .

Now for  $c_1 \in p_1(M)$ , from  $\text{tp}_\beta^3 \left[ \left( \frac{acl(\bar{a}+c_1)}{acl(\bar{a})} \right), M \right]$  we can compute for every complete type over  $acl(\bar{a} + c_1)$  not forking over  $\bar{a}$ , and  $\bar{d}$  realizing  $r$ ,  $\text{tp}_\beta^3 \left[ \left( \frac{acl(\bar{a}+\bar{d}+c_1)}{acl(\bar{a}+\bar{d})} \right), M \right]$  — by  $(C1)_\beta$ , then we can compute for each such  $r, \bar{d}$ ,

$$\left\{ \text{tp}_\beta^3 \left[ \left( \frac{acl(\bar{a} + \bar{d} + c_2)}{acl(\bar{a} + \bar{d})} \right), M \right] : c_2 \in p_2(M) \text{ and } \frac{c_2}{acl(\bar{a} + \bar{d} + c_1)} \perp_a (\bar{a} + \bar{d}) \right. \\ \left. (\text{necessarily } c_2 \bigcup_{\bar{a}} \bar{d}) \right\}$$

(this by  $(C3)_\beta$ ).

*Proof of  $(B1)_\alpha$ .* As in earlier cases we can restrict ourselves to the case  $\text{Dp}(p_\ell) > 0$ . We can find  $(c_\ell, \bar{b}_\ell) \in r_\ell(M)$ ,  $\bar{b}_1 \bigcup_{\bar{a}} \bar{b}_2, c_1 \bar{b}_1 \bigcup_{\bar{a}} \bar{b}_2$  (by [Sh:c, X, 7.3(6)]). By 2.8(2) (and the definition) from  $\text{tp}_\alpha^2 \left[ \left( \frac{p_1, r_1}{\bar{a}} \right), M \right]$  we can compute that it is equal to  $\text{tp}_\alpha^1 \left[ \left( \frac{c_1 / acl(\bar{a} + \bar{b}_1)}{acl(\bar{a} + \bar{b}_1)} \right), M \right]$ .

By  $(A1)_\alpha$  we can compute  $\text{tp}_\alpha^1 \left[ \left( \frac{c_1 / acl(\bar{a} + \bar{b}_1 + \bar{b}_2)}{acl(\bar{a} + \bar{b}_1 + \bar{b}_2)} \right), M \right]$  hence by  $(A3)_\alpha$  we can compute  $\text{tp}_\alpha^1 \left[ \left( \frac{c_2 / acl(\bar{a} + \bar{b}_1 + \bar{b}_2)}{acl(\bar{a} + \bar{b}_1 + \bar{b}_2)} \right), M \right]$ .

Now use  $(A2)_\alpha$  to compute  $\text{tp}_\alpha^1 \left[ \left( \frac{c_2 / acl(\bar{a} + \bar{b}_2)}{acl(\bar{a} + \bar{b}_2)} \right), M \right]$  and by 2.8(2), 2.4(2) it is equal to  $\text{tp}_\alpha^2 \left[ \left( \frac{p, r}{\bar{a}} \right), M \right]$ .

*Proof of  $(B2)_\alpha$ .* Choose  $(c, \bar{b}) \in r(M)$ ,  $c\bar{b} \bigcup_{\bar{a}} \bar{a}_1$ .

From  $\text{tp}_\alpha^2[(\frac{p, r_1}{\bar{a}}, M)]$  we can compute  $\text{tp}_\alpha^1[(\frac{c/(\bar{a}+\bar{b})}{\bar{a}+\bar{b}}, M)]$  (just — see 2.8(2) and Definition 2.4), from it we can compute  $\text{tp}_\alpha^1[(\frac{c/(\bar{a}+\bar{b}+\bar{a}_1)}{(\bar{a}+\bar{b}+\bar{a}_1)}, M)]$  (by  $(A1)_\alpha$ ), from it we can compute  $\text{tp}_\alpha^2[(\frac{p, r_2}{\bar{a}_2}, M)]$  (see 2.8(2) and Definition 2.4).

*Proof of  $(B3)_\alpha$ .* Let  $(\frac{p, r}{\bar{b}_1}) \in \Gamma_r^s, p \perp \bar{a}_1$  be given. So necessarily  $\frac{\bar{a}_1}{\bar{a}} \pm p$  (this to enable us to use  $(B2, 3)$ ). It suffices to compute  $\text{tp}_\alpha^2[(\frac{p, r}{\bar{b}_1}, M)]$  and we can discard the case  $\text{Dp}(p) = 0$ .

So  $p$  is regular  $\pm \bar{b}_1, \perp \bar{a}_1$ , hence  $p \pm \bar{b}, p \perp \bar{a}$ , and as  $\bar{a} \subseteq \bar{b}, \bar{b} = \text{acl}(\bar{b})$  we can find  $r, (\frac{p, r_1}{\bar{b}}) \in \Gamma_{pr}$ , (see 2.3) and we know  $\text{tp}_\alpha^2[(\frac{p, r_1}{\bar{b}}, M)]$ , and we can find  $r_2$ , a complete type over  $\bar{b}_1$  extending  $r_1$  which does not fork over  $\bar{b}_1$ . From  $\text{tp}_\alpha^2[(\frac{p, r_1}{\bar{b}}, M)]$  we can compute  $\text{tp}_\alpha^2[(\frac{p, r_2}{\bar{b}_1}, M)]$  by  $(B2)_\alpha$ , and from it  $\text{tp}_\alpha^2[(\frac{p, r}{\bar{b}_1}, M)]$  by  $(B1)_\alpha$ .

*Proof of  $(C2)_\alpha$ .* Similar, use  $(B3)_\alpha$  instead of  $(B2)_\alpha$ .

*Proof of  $(C3)_\alpha$ .* Without loss of generality  $\frac{\bar{b}^*}{\bar{b}}$  is semi regular, let  $p^*$  be a regular type not orthogonal to it and without loss of generality  $\text{Dp}(p^*) > 0 \Rightarrow \frac{\bar{b}^*}{\bar{b}}$  regular (as in 2.3).

If  $p^*$  has depth zero, then the only  $p$  appearing in the definition  $\text{tp}_\alpha^3([\frac{\bar{b}}{\bar{a}}], M)$  is  $p^*$  (up to  $\pm$ ) and this is easy. Then  $\text{tp}_\alpha^2$  is just the dimension and we have no problem.

So assume  $p^*$  has depth  $> 0$ . We can by  $(B1)_\alpha, (B2)_\alpha$  compute  $\text{tp}_\alpha^2[(\frac{p', q'}{\bar{b}^*}, M)]$  when  $p' \pm \bar{b}, p' \pm p^*$  (regardless of the choice of  $\bar{b}^*$ ). Next assume  $p' \pm p^*$ ; by  $(B1)_\alpha$  without loss of generality  $q'$  does not fork over  $\bar{b}$ . As  $\text{Dp}(p^*) > 0$ , it is trivial (and we assume  $w_p(\bar{b}^*, \bar{b}) = 1$ ) hence  $\bar{b}^*/\bar{b}$  is regular so in  $\text{tp}_\alpha^2[(\frac{p, q'}{\bar{b}^*}, M)]$  we just lose a weight 1 for one specific  $\text{tp}_\beta^3$  type: the one  $\bar{b}^*$  realizes concerning which we have a free choice. We are left with the cases  $p' \pm \bar{b}, p' \pm p^*$ ; well we know  $\text{tp}_\beta^3$  but we have to add  $\text{tp}_\alpha^3$ ? Use Claim 2.6(3) (and  $(A1)_\alpha$  as we add a parameter).  $\square_{2.9}$

**2.10 Claim.**  $\text{tp}_\gamma^3[(\frac{\bar{b}}{\bar{a}}), M], \text{tp}_\gamma^3[\bar{a}, M], \text{tp}_\gamma^3[M]$  are expressible by formulas in  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}^\gamma(d, q.)$ .

By 2.9 we have

*2.11 Conclusion.* If  $\text{Dp}(T) < \infty$  then:

- 1) From  $\text{tp}_\infty^3[(\frac{B}{A}), M]$  we can compute  $\text{tp}_\infty[(\frac{B}{A}), M]$  (type — from §1).
- 2) Similarly from  $\text{tp}_\infty^3[A, M]$  we can compute  $\text{tp}_\infty[A, M]$ .

From 2.6, 2.10, 2.11 and 1.27 we get

**2.12 Corollary.** If  $\gamma = \text{Dp}(T)$  and  $M, N$  are  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated, then

$$M \cong N \Leftrightarrow \text{tp}_\gamma^3[M] = \text{tp}_\gamma^3[N] \Leftrightarrow M \cong_{\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}^\gamma(d, q.)} N.$$

## APPENDIX

The following clarifies several issues raised by Baldwin. A consequence of

- ⊗ the existence of nice invariants for characterization up to isomorphism (or characterization of the models up to isomorphism by their  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory for suitable logic  $\mathcal{L}$ )

naturally give absoluteness, e.g. extending the universe say by nice forcing preserve non-isomorphism. So negative results for

- (\*) is non-isomorphism (of models of  $T$ ) preserved by forcing by “nice forcing notions”?

implies that we cannot characterize models up to isomorphism by their  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory when the logic  $\mathcal{L}$  is “nice”, i.e. when  $Th_{\mathcal{L}}(M)$  preserved by nice forcing notions. So coding a stationary set by the isomorphism type can be interpreted as strong evidence of “no nice invariants”, see [Sh 220]. Baldwin, Laskowski, Shelah [BLS<sub>h</sub> 464] show that not only for every unsuperstable; but also for some quite trivial superstable (with NDOP, NOTOP) countable  $T$ , there are non-isomorphic models which can be made isomorphic by some ccc (even  $\sigma$ -centered) forcing notion. This shows that the lack of a really finite characterization is serious.

Can we still get from the characterization in this paper an absoluteness result? Note that for preserving  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturation (for simplicity for models of countable  $T$ ) we need to add no reals<sup>2</sup>, and in order not to erase distinction of dimensions we want not to collapse cardinals, so the following questions is natural, for a first order (countable) complete  $T$ :

- (\*) <sub>$T$</sub> <sup>1</sup> assume  $V_1 \subseteq V_2$  are transitive models of ZFC with the same cardinals and reals, the theory  $T \in V_1$ . If the models  $M_1, M_2$  are from  $V_1$  and they are models of  $T$  not isomorphic in  $V_1$ ; must they still be not isomorphic in  $V_2$ <sup>3</sup>
- (\*) <sub>$T$</sub> <sup>2</sup> like (\*) <sub>$T$</sub> <sup>1</sup> we assume in addition  $\mathcal{P}(|T_1|)^{V_1} = \mathcal{P}(|T_1|)^{V_2}$ .

Of course, for countable  $T$  the answer is negative even for  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated models except for superstable, NDOP, NOTOP theories so we restrict ourselves to these. It should be quite transparent that  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_\epsilon}(q.d.)$ -theory is preserved from  $V_1$  to  $V_2$  (as well as the set of sentences in the logic), hence for the class of  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated models (of superstable NDOP, NOTOP theory  $T$ ) the answer to (\*) <sub>$T$</sub> <sup>2</sup> is yes.

---

<sup>2</sup>(the set of  $\{acl(\bar{a}) : \bar{a} \in {}^{\omega>}M\}$  is absolute but the set of their enumeration and of the  $\{f \upharpoonright (acl(\bar{a})) : f \in \text{AUT}(\mathfrak{C}), f(\bar{a}) = \bar{a}\}$  is not).

<sup>3</sup>Note we did not say they have the same  $\omega$ -sequences of ordinals, e.g. if  $V_2 = V_1^P$ ,  $P$  Prikry forcing, then the assumption of (\*) <sub>$T$</sub>  holds though a new  $\omega$ -sequence of ordinals was added. So for  $V_1 \subseteq V_2$  as in (\*) <sub>$T$</sub> , the  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \aleph_1}$ -theory is not necessarily preserved.

## REFERENCES.

- [BLSh 464] John T. Baldwin, Michael C. Laskowski, and Saharon Shelah. Forcing Isomorphism. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **58**:1291–1301, 1993.
- [BeSh 307] Steven Buechler and Saharon Shelah. On the existence of regular types. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, **45**:277–308, 1989.
- [Sh 220] Saharon Shelah. Existence of many  $L_{\infty, \lambda}$ -equivalent, nonisomorphic models of  $T$  of power  $\lambda$ . *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, **34**:291–310, 1987. Proceedings of the Model Theory Conference, Trento, June 1986.
- [Sh 225] Saharon Shelah. On the number of strongly  $\aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated models of power  $\lambda$ . *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, **36**:279–287, 1987. See also [Sh:225a].
- [Sh:c] Saharon Shelah. *Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models*, volume 92 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, xxxiv+705 pp, 1990.